

WILEY



A • M • E • R • I • C • A • N
A N T H R O P O L O G I C A L
A S S O C I A T I O N

Bear Ceremonialism in the Northern Hemisphere

Author(s): A. Irving Hallowell

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Jan. - Mar., 1926), pp. 1-175

Published by: [Wiley](#) on behalf of the [American Anthropological Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/660810>

Accessed: 03/03/2013 16:06

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Wiley and American Anthropological Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Anthropologist*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

American Anthropologist

NEW SERIES

Vol. 28

JANUARY-March, 1926

No. 1

BEAR CEREMONIALISM IN THE NORTHERN HEMISPHERE*

By A. IRVING HALLOWELL

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
Man's Relation to the Animal World.....	3
Origin of Concepts Relating to Animals.....	12
Nature and Scope of Problem to be Investigated.....	21
Geographical Distribution of Bears.....	25
Hibernation Habits of the Species and Associated Folk Beliefs.....	27
The Bear Hunt.....	31
Time of Attack.....	31
Methods and Weapons.....	33
North America.....	33
Eurasia.....	38
Linguistic Terminology for the Bear.....	43
North America.....	43
Algonkian-Speaking Tribes.....	43
Miscellaneous.....	47
Eurasia.....	48
Kamchadal.....	48
Yukaghir.....	48
Ainu.....	48
Ural-Altaic Peoples.....	49
Indo-European Peoples.....	51
The Custom of Talking to the Bear.....	53
Calling the Bear out of its Den.....	53
Conciliatory Speeches.....	54
Address of Apology.....	55
Death Attributed to a Specious Agency.....	57
Other Features.....	58
Post-Mortem Ceremonies and Customs.....	61
North America.....	136
Eastern Woodland Area.....	136

* Dissertation offered in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Pennsylvania, June, 1924.

Southeastern Area.....	72
Mackenzie Area.....	72
Plateau Area.....	73
Plains Area.....	73
North Pacific Coast Area.....	74
California-Great Basin Area.....	76
Southwest Area.....	77
Eskimo Area.....	79
Eurasia.....	80
Northeastern Siberia.....	81
Central Siberia.....	86
Western Siberia.....	87
Finns.....	95
Lapps.....	99
Amur-Gulf of Tartary Region.....	106
The Simpler Ceremonies of the Gilyak and Ainu.....	131
Disposal of Remains.....	135
North America.....	136
Eastern Woodland Area.....	136
Mackenzie Area.....	141
Plateau.....	142
Eurasia.....	144
Comparative Discussion of Post-Mortem Observances.....	144
Historical Deductions and Conclusions.....	148
The Psychological Hypothesis.....	148
The Economic Hypothesis.....	152
Historico-Geographical Interpretation.....	153
Bibliography.....	163

INTRODUCTION

ONE OF THE MOST interesting lines of approach to the culture of primitive peoples lies in a study of the relationship of any human group to the physical environment and biota of its habitat. No matter whether we begin our investigation with a study of material culture or subjective life, we soon discover that the intricacies of this relationship confront us at every turn. From the economic angle, of course, the tools, traps, weapons, or other devices which comprise a people's material equipment for making a living are of primary significance, but the traditional manner in which their relations to the natural world about them are conceived is an equally important topic. This aspect of the problem, the geographer usually ignores. It is often through the channels of thought which lead to an interpretation of natural

phenomena, however, that the ethnologist makes important discoveries regarding the basis of magico-religious beliefs. A knowledge of this stratum of thought often enables one to interpret much in the behavior of primitive people which would otherwise remain obscure. Moreover, one is further led to see that the adjustments made to the external features of the environment, far from being exclusively automatic or utilitarian in their nature, are governed to a large extent by factors of a socio-psychological order. This fact is of great importance in any investigation which concerns, as does ours, the relation of man to any or all of the living creatures of his environment, the class of natural phenomena to which he himself belongs.

MAN'S RELATION TO THE ANIMAL WORLD

Fundamentally, the study of man's relationship to the faunal world can be approached from two standpoints. First is the *utilitarian*, that is, the exploitation of animals for their flesh, skins, or other substances and, in the case of domesticated species, for services or products useful to man. The nearly universal dependence of human beings on a partially carnivorous diet, perhaps entirely so in the Paleolithic period, and the absence of data which would indicate that any peoples since Neolithic times have lived as strict vegetarians, sufficiently indicate the deep seated character of these food habits. The historical importance, therefore, of this intimate economic relationship of animals and man, is apparent. The domestication of animals, although relatively recent in time, is perhaps the most important chapter in the history of this age-long economic exploitation which animals have undergone progressively at the hands of man.

Second, we can study man's relation to the animals of his environment as he himself views it; that is to say, in its *psychological* aspect. Under this head may be included the enormous mass of folk beliefs and customs connected with animals which are so typical of primitive cultures. In this study we shall be concerned with certain specific aspects of the relation of man and animals as viewed from this latter standpoint.

Historically, it is legitimate, perhaps, to assume that the psychological phase of man's relation to animals grew up along with the utilitarian and that specific beliefs and practices took their characteristic forms at a very early period, in conjunction, no doubt, with the development of thought and custom along other lines. The cave art of Paleolithic man, for example, has been interpreted as the earliest manifestation of magico-religious attitudes toward the species of animals there represented.¹

While the truth or falsity of this assumption need not detain us here, it is apparent that even at this early epoch man's view of a considerable number of animal species was not *exclusively* utilitarian. There was a reaction to animal life, whether esthetic, magico-religious, or both, which stimulated what to our minds is an astonishing artistic performance, no matter what may be the consensus of opinion in respect to its subjective significance.

Nevertheless, it may be well here to sound a note of warning against the naïve assumption that the cultural manifestations of Paleolithic man supply us with data which throw light on the *origins* of man's earliest attitudes toward animals. Thousands

¹ Macalister, e.g., discussing this question, rejects the view that the cave art represents a purely esthetic manifestation (pp. 500, 504), "religious iconography" (p. 505), or totemistic beliefs (pp. 505-6). He is inclined to follow S. Reinach (*L'Art et la Magie, à propos des peintures et des gravures de l'âge du renne*, *L'Anth.* XIV, 1903, p. 257 ff.) who regards the depiction of animals as a magical means for facilitating their capture or increasing the food supply of Paleolithic man. Reinach relied to a considerable extent upon the argument that only useful animals are depicted but, as Macalister points out, this assumption has been somewhat weakened by the discovery of the felines of Les Combarelles. For a summary of the author's psychological interpretations of the cave art see p. 510.

Obermaier, pp. 259-264, follows the magico-religious hypothesis, as does MacCurdy, I, pp. 230, 239, 251.

Burkitt endorses the magical interpretation of the cave art (p. 313) but in respect to the *art mobilier* expresses the view that "though magic played a great part, decoration must certainly be included, and besides we have probably sketches made by the artist to take into the cave with him, and also school practice" (p. 316).

Boule (p. 257 note) holds strongly to the view that fundamentally the cave art is a purely esthetic phenomenon "without at the same time refusing to allow a certain influence due to the practice of magic."

Osborn is non-committal. He says (pp. 358-9), "How far their artistic work in the caverns was an expression of such (a religious) sentiment and how far it was an outcome of a purely artistic impulse are matters for very careful study."

of years of human cultural development had preceded the florescence of this art, and its geographical distribution is limited to a small portion of Europe. From the single stream of cultural development which this art probably represents, we must not, therefore, allow ourselves to generalize regarding man's psychological reactions. If our contemporary knowledge of primitive cultures is any criterion, we have every reason to believe that then, as now, cultural differences characterized mankind and that divergencies in man's attitude toward animals had probably set in.

In order, however, to bring into bolder relief the outstanding attitudes which in general typify primitive cultures studied in recent times, it will not be inaccurate to group them *en bloc*, for the purpose of comparison with the prevalent attitudes toward the animal kingdom found in Euro-American society. From these they all differ in several important respects.

In our culture, as a result of several centuries of the scientific tradition, animal life has been studied from a rational point of view. On the one hand, this mental attitude has led to a classification of the creatures of the earth into phyla, orders, classes, etc., based on their morphology and genetic relationships, and, on the other, to an interpretation of animal behavior in terms of instincts, reflexes, environmental adaptations, and so forth. Consequently, there is today a marked absence² of "folk attitudes" toward animals, based on oral tradition alone and unchecked by

² This statement is to be taken, of course, in a relative sense and quantitatively. Customs such as "telling the bees," among the European peasantry are, after all, very few in number and of relative insignificance. At the same time there are pseudo-scientific explanations of animal behavior found current even among professional investigators, as well as the laity, which border on the folkloristic. An attempt is made to extend the frontiers of scientifically attested facts by speculation. Analogical reasoning is resorted to and the usual anthropomorphism results. A folk-lore of animal conduct thus takes its rise, of which wild or domestic creatures may be the subjects, and for which the professional investigator is often as responsible as the layman. Perhaps (as Dr. A. A. Goldenweiser has suggested to the writer) we may even go so far as to say that in view of the many "human characteristics" which many animals undoubtedly exhibit—in temperament, facial expression, social qualities, etc., it would be strange if we human beings did not observe this fact and transmute it into some form of anthropomorphic attitude towards such creatures.

scientific observation and experiment. In fact, a serious interest in animal life and habits has been absorbed almost completely by professional groups (naturalists, zoologists, physiologists, psychologists) and the lay person usually receives his stock of information more or less directly from this source. The development of urban living has, no doubt, largely contributed to this condition, as more and more people have become divorced not only from any first-hand observation of wild animals, but also from personal contact with domesticated species, except those which, being enjoyed for their social or esthetic qualities, are retained as household pets. Thus, animals in our culture have come to be viewed in an almost exclusively practical light³—to furnish food, clothing, service, esthetic pleasure or sport—untinctured for the most part with folkloristic associations.

On the psychological side, therefore, the prevailing view of the animal world in Euro-American society is characterized by a paucity of folkloristic elements, coupled with an assumed superiority to other orders of sentient beings. These traits differentiate our culture from those of primitive peoples, no matter how the latter may vary from each other in the details of their concepts. Not that the utilitarian relationship, from an objective standpoint, is less important to them, but it is embellished in their minds with a rich, varied, and, to us, even a fantastic mass of beliefs which are inseparable from it and lead to practices which are curious and even unintelligible without some knowledge of the accompanying philosophy of nature.

Another contrasting feature, paradoxical though it may be, deserves emphasis. This is the thoroughgoing practical knowledge of the life, habits, and structure of animals, which the average individual in a primitive culture commands—a knowledge, indeed, which many naturalists would be happy to possess.⁴ Particularly

³ Except in some quarters where humanitarian sentiments or vegetarianism are stressed as the proper ethical attitudes.

⁴ Speck (6) points out that the knowledge of the Wabanaki tribes regarding mammals is more extensive and exact than their information about birds, which is to be accounted for by their almost entire dependence upon the hunt as a means of subsistence (p. 350). It is also interesting to note that their knowledge of ornithological facts is "based really less upon observation than upon interpretation" (p. 351).

is this true in cultures where hunting or fishing is the chief pursuit. This information is tightly interwoven with the folkloristic elements, however, and consequently we find that observation almost imperceptibly gives way to the dominating influence of the peculiar modes of folk-thought characteristic of the group, if an individual is pressed for an explanation of some specific bit of animal behavior. Whereas the scientist will resort to rational modes of explanation and stop there, the explanation advanced by the hunter or fisherman of a primitive community will be traceable to, and consistent with, the folkloristic pattern congenial to him because he has been reared in its *milieu*.⁵

Unchecked, then, by scientific observation, we find the utmost variety of beliefs which, in primitive cultures, are held regarding the origin, relationships, characteristics, behavior, and capacities of animals. Practically all of them are decidedly exotic to our habits of thought.⁶ Animals are believed to have essentially the same sort of animating agency which man possesses.⁷ They have a language of their own, can understand what human beings say and do, have forms of social or tribal organization, and live a life which is parallel in other respects to that of human societies⁸.

Henderson and Harrington write; "That the Indians have been close observers of animals is shown by the fact that they have developed names for almost all the parts of birds and mammals, as claws, whiskers, foot-pads, etc." (p. 9). Although the Tewa "distinguish species more closely than the average white man who has not had zoologic training" (p. 7), yet the "Indian nomenclature as a whole recognizes differences, not relationships. There is little, if any, evidence of the classification . . . of species in consanguineous groups, as orders, families, and genera, except in very obvious cases. Whether he does so arrange them in his mind, even though he does not express the idea in his nomenclature, is very doubtful and should be more fully investigated." (p. 8).

⁵ Goldenweiser (3), p. 243.

⁶ It would be presumptuous of course to attempt a comprehensive register of these concepts, but for the sake of contrast to our own attitudes some of the more common ones are reviewed. The footnotes simply refer to a few outstanding illustrations. Cf. the article by N. W. Thomas.

⁷ E.g. the Chukchi (Czaplicka (5), p. 260); Ainu (ibid p. 275); the Altaians (ibid., p. 282); Sternberg (1), p. 248, sums up the attitude of the Gilyak thus: "Every animal is in point of fact a real being like a man, nay a Gilyak such as himself, but endowed with reason and strength which often surpasses those of man." Cf. N. W. Thomas.

⁸ To the Penobscot mind (Speck (6), pp. 349-50) the "order of birds, like themselves, constituted tribes and bands, separated by their different structure, manners

Magical or supernatural powers are also at the disposal of certain species; they may metamorphosize themselves into other creatures or, upon occasion, into human form;⁹ some of them may utilize their powers to aid man in his pursuits; others may be hostile. Dreams¹⁰ may become a specialized means of communication between man and animals, or by the interpretation of the cries or movements of certain creatures, man may be able to guide his destiny for good or ill.¹¹ Animals may also become deities on their own account, or the temporary or permanent abode of "gods" or "spirits," or for other reasons¹² come to assume an especially sacred character.¹³ They may become the messengers of a deity,¹⁴ play the rôle of "guardian spirits" to man,¹⁵ become culture

and utterances, as each tribe, though subdivided into smaller groups, retains its form in customs and language particular to that nation or genus from which it seems to have descended." They had their head chief, usually the eagle, minor chiefs, and local groups. For Chukchi beliefs see Bogoras (2) pp. 283-4.

⁹ "Identification of man and animals and transformation of one into the other are most characteristic traits of primitive belief. These identifications and transformations, the primary source of which must lie in the obvious physical and psychic similarities between man and beast constitute the favorite theme of all mythologies." Goldenweiser (4) p. 631.

¹⁰ F. G. Speck (8).

¹¹ See e.g. the topic Augury in the article Divination. H. E. Vol. 4, pp. 778-9.

¹² According to Max Müller (chapt. IX) the predynastic Egyptians worshipped animals as divine in themselves, although in later times there was a belief in the reincarnation of celestial gods in animal form. This was a secondary development. He also draws attention to the fact that cats were *sacred* but not *divine*, i.e. they could not receive prayers and offerings. But this was too subtle a distinction for popular consumption and such sacred creatures were actually termed "gods." See also the similar view of Budge, p. 345, and for special studies A. Wiedmann, *Tierkult der alten Aegypter*, 1912; T. Hopfner, *Tierkult der alten Aegypter* (Denkschriften als ad. Wien. LVII Abh. 2). Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, Chap. IV, discusses the alleged theiromorphic deities for the whole eastern Mediterranean area and among other points, strictures the loose manner in which the word "worship" has been used by both ancient and modern writers. See also the very superficial chapter on "The Worship of Animals" in E. Washburn Hopkins (2).

¹³ The veneration of the water-buffalo by the Toda (Rivers (2) and the horse by the Yakut may be mentioned in this connection. (Jochelson (7), p. 262).

¹⁴ Among the Wabanaki tribes the wolf and the loon were thought to be the messengers of Gluskabe; among the Borneans (Hose and McDougall) the hawk played a similar rôle.

¹⁵ See Benedict.

heroes¹⁶ or a demiurge.¹⁷ On the other hand, a belief in the transmigration of human souls into animal form may prevail.¹⁸ Frequently, too, animals appear in the ancestral tree of man¹⁹ or become the eponyms of social units.²⁰

Folk-lore and mythology give detailed expression to many of these beliefs²¹ and others can be inferred from customs which have such concepts as a motivating background.²² In decorative art,²³ also, animal motifs play an outstanding rôle in several cultures, and the movements and characteristics of animals frequently are dramatized in dances.²⁴

As indicated even in this rough survey of the varied rôle which animals may come to play in the beliefs and behavior of primitive peoples, the association of animals with patterns of magico-religious thought is especially important. In many cultures, indeed, without a grasp of his attitude toward animals, an understanding of the deeper layers of the philosophy of primitive man remains obscure. It becomes apparent, for example, that the categories of rational thought, by which we are accustomed to separate human life from animal life and the supernatural from the natural, are drawn upon lines which the facts of primitive cultures do not fit. If we are to understand or interpret the *Weltanschauung* of peoples who entertain such notions, therefore, we must rebuild the specific content of these categories upon the

¹⁶ In North America the raven and coyote are familiar examples.

¹⁷ N. W. Thomas p. 485.

¹⁸ See N. W. Thomas pp. 488-9 and pp. 493-4 where a considerable number of sources are listed. Frazer has an encyclopedic compilation in Ch. 16.

¹⁹ Notably in some, although not in all, totemistic groups. Consult Goldenweiser (1), pp. 253-4.

²⁰ In particular they are found to be associated with sibs as in Australia, among the tribes of Southeastern United States, the Iroquois and on the Northwest Coast of America. Their fitness for the role of classifiers is discussed by Goldenweiser (2), p. 293.

²¹ As characters in the oral literature of practically all primitive peoples, animals play a proportionately large part. Folk-lore is not always, however, an adequate record of contemporary beliefs, because it may refer to the world as conceived in a mythological past, when the relation of men and animals was "different."

²² E.g., food taboos, the propitiation of game animals, etc.

²³ Especially in Magdalenian art; on the Northwest Coast of America, the Amur region, Melanesia. Cf. N. W. Thomas, p. 485.

²⁴ N. W. Thomas, pp. 495-6.

foundation of *their* beliefs, not ours. The truth or falsity of the categories is not at issue but simply the inapplicability of our concepts of them as a point of departure for a comprehension of primitive thought.

As a concrete illustration of the mingling of magico-religious concepts with the utilitarian relationship of animals and man, let us consider the attitude of the hunter toward the game on which his livelihood depends.

From our point of view we are inclined to be impressed with the mechanical devices which primitive man has elaborated for the purpose of trapping, snaring, spearing, or shooting animals and the skill which he exhibits in the manipulation of them compels our admiration. Consequently, we measure his success in these terms. But, in doing so, we ignore the subjective aspect of the food and pelt quest which, I think, bulks larger in the consciousness of the individual hunter than the knowledge and skill which so forcibly impress us at first glance. That is to say, the primitive hunter finds himself in a radically different position with regard to the game he pursues than can be inferred from our own habits of thought. To him the animal world often represents creatures with magical or superhuman potencies, and the problem of securing them for their hide, meat or fur involves the satisfaction of powers or beings of a supernatural order. Consequently, strategy and mechanical skill are only part of the problem. Success or failure in the hunt is more likely to be interpreted in magico religious terms than in those of a mechanical order.

Hill-Tout,²⁵ in discussing the salmon ceremonies of the Lillooet, sums up the matter in a way which allows of a broader generalization. He says that their significance "is easy to perceive when we remember the attitude of the Indians toward nature generally, and recall their myths relating to the salmon, and their coming to their rivers and streams. Nothing that the Indian of this region eats is regarded by him as mere food and nothing more. Not a single plant, animal, or fish, or other object upon which he feeds, is looked upon in this light, or as something he has secured for

²⁵ Hill-tout (1), p. 140.

himself by his own wit and skill. He regards it as something which has been voluntarily and compassionately placed in his hands by the good will and consent of the 'spirit' of the object itself, or by the intercession and magic of his culture heroes, to be retained and used by him only upon the fulfillment of certain conditions. These conditions include respect and reverent care in the killing or plucking of the animal or plant and proper treatment of the parts for which he has no use, such as the bones, blood, and offal, and the depositing of the same in some stream or lake, so that the object may by that means renew its life and physical form.

"The practices in connection with the killing of animals and the gathering of plants and fruits all make this quite clear, and it is only when we bear this attitude of the savage toward nature in mind that we can hope to rightly understand the motives and purposes of many of his strange customs and beliefs."

Skinner,²⁶ writing of the Menomini, observes that: "Besides the use of such practical devices as traps and snares, the Menomini resort to every possible form of sympathetic and contagious magic in order to overpower and secure the game with which their country abounds. The means employed vary from simple charms and powders with their mystic formulae, to complicated bundles. . . . The actual skill of the hunter amounted to nothing if he received no assistance from above. Without such help his mere ability to approach the game, his knowledge of their haunts and his accuracy with weapons were useless; moreover, he was at the mercy of wicked people, sorcerers and witches." The unsuccessful hunt was thus easy to explain. Levy-Bruhl is probably not far wrong, therefore, in generalizing this attitude for the primitive world at large.²⁷

²⁶ Skinner (2), pp. 131-2. Cf. Speck (7), pp. 455, 457, 464. Throughout the territory occupied by the Montagnais-Naskapi peoples, in fact, the soul-spirits of the game animals must be satisfied by certain observances on the part of the hunter, or else no animals will be caught. Also Bogoras (3) pp. 207-209: ". . . the chase . . . is not conceived as a natural competition of the hunter and the animal in strength, skill and cunning." It is "far more a competition of man and animal in magical knowledge."

²⁷ Levy-Bruhl, p. 341, "Whatever the instrument., weapons, tools, or processes employed, primitives . . . never consider success certain or even possible if these

Attitudes and practices such as these, expressing such radically different concepts of man's relation to the faunal world from those to which we are acculturated, are instructive as an indication of the range of subjective values, available for study in primitive society. Exotic attitudes toward animals introduce us to new levels of the magico-religious consciousness where propitiation, taboo, ceremonials, worship, etc. are mingled with economic pursuits, to which they give us a psychological key. For purposes of study they may be dissociated from these practical activities, but from the viewpoint of the human beings habituated to them, they form an integral part of the hunt.

ORIGIN OF CONCEPTS RELATING TO ANIMALS

We may now turn to a brief discussion of a very fundamental question, but one to which there is no satisfactory answer. How did the ideas originate which characterize primitive man's view of the animal world and his relation to it?

Under the influence of the theory of evolution, anthropologists of a generation ago were stimulated to attack the problem of cultural origins by projecting into the past interpretations of the mentality of early man derived from the study of "modern savages." Theories were deduced from data assembled by means of the so-called "comparative method" with its corollary, the doctrine of "survivals," abetted in some instances by the arbitrary selection of certain peoples as representing the earliest stages in cultural evolution. The problem of origins was "solved" by reconstructing for early man a mental disposition which seemed the logical medium for the expression of the ideas and customs actually found in primitive cultures. Psychological reactions to the outer world, assumed to be similar everywhere in the human species and entirely divorced from antecedent cultural determina-

alone are used, without the concurrence of the unseen powers having been secured. Material aids, although indispensable, play but a subordinate part." P. 308—"The primitive who has a successful hunting expedition, or reaps an abundant harvest, or triumphs over his enemy in war, debits this favorable result not (as the European in a similar case would do) to the excellence of his instruments or weapons, nor to his own ingenuity and efforts, but to the indispensable assistance of the unseen powers."

tion, were imputed to this hypothetical *homo*. These responses were believed to have given rise to the earliest steps in human progress.

In recent years, however, this method has been shown to be a highly unscientific and gratuitous procedure.²⁸ As Goldenweiser puts it—man's "original nature is an abstraction or at best but a reconstruction born of doubtful premises, swaying insecurely in the chronological vacuum of missing links."²⁹ Nevertheless, the method referred to has been utilized by most writers who discuss the origin and development of religion,³⁰ and even contemporary students cling to it.³¹ Consequently we find many attempts to explain the origin of beliefs, customs, cults, ceremonials, etc., in which animals figure,³² in terms consistent with the theory of religious origins advocated by the author.³³ What is usually termed "animal worship" occupies a more or less conspicuous place in the discussion of these authorities, although different

²⁸ Boas (6); Goldenweiser (5)· Rivers (1).

²⁹ Goldenweiser (6), p. 328.

³⁰ See Schleiter's critical review, particularly chapters 2 and 3.

³¹ E.g. Hopkins (2).

³² Insofar, of course, as these seem to fit into the religious category of thought and behavior assumed by the writer. See Lowie (5), Introduction, for a discussion of the difficulties involved in a satisfactory definition of religious phenomena.

³³ If, for example, as Tylor would have it, the original psychical predisposition of man prompted him to view the world animistically, then the "sense of an absolute physical distinction between man and beast" being absent, "the cries of beasts and birds seem like human languages and their actions guided as it were by human thought" (I, p. 469). Early man, therefore, naturally attributes to animals many of the same psychological characteristics and capabilities which he himself possesses; he may go even further and endow them with powers which, in particular cases, far surpass his own (II, 229). Animals may thus become the focus of religious veneration or worship as do other natural objects or forces in nature. Or, according to Marett's theory, man, instead of interpreting nature and animals in terms of an animating "spiritual" agency, developed his religious notions in some "pre-animistic stage." He sees in nature some vague, mysterious, supernatural or occult "power" or "force" as the *modus operandi*, and animals which display odd or uncanny characteristics, "white animal" (e.g., white elephants or white buffaloes), birds of night (notably the owl), monkeys, mice, frogs, crabs, snakes, and lizards; in fact, a host of strange and grewsome beasts, are to the savage of their own right and on the face of them, instinct with dreadful divinity" (p. 21). Spencer on the other hand derived "animal worship" from the propitiation of ghosts, the cornerstone of his theory of religious origins (p. 353 and chap. xxii).

writers do not use the term to cover identical or even similar beliefs and practices.³⁴ As most of them, either implicitly or explicitly, assume a unilinear theory of religious evolution, "animal worship" is frequently accorded a distinct stage in the early religious development of mankind.³⁵

On the other hand, some writers have endeavored to explain the emergence of specific animals into prominence as the objects of magico-religious beliefs and customs, by emphasizing some selective factor as the cause of the veneration given to them. If particular species are respected, venerated, worshipped, or become the center of a cult or a set of customs which imply a religious attitude, whereas other animals are not so regarded, it is said to be due to the fact that the former possess certain

³⁴ Like so many terms used to describe religious phenomena "worship" is used in a loose and ambiguous sense. Thomas (p. 486), commenting upon this fact, says "at one end of the scale we find the real divine animal, commonly conceived as a 'god-body,' i.e., the temporary incarnation of a superior being, with a circle of worshippers. At the other end, separated from the real cult by imperceptible transitions, we find such practices as respect for the bones of slain animals, or the use of a respectful name for the living animal." Hopkins (2) in discussing animal worship, includes all varieties of reverence and respect for animals, as well as the veneration of animal gods. Specific practices, often similar in their nature, also draw forth a variation in the terminology which is used to describe them. The ceremonialism of which bears are the object among the northern peoples of America and Eurasia is selected by Saussaye to illustrate "animal worship" I (p. 98), while to I. King (p. 247) similar practices are characterized as "typical of the kind of acts out of which worship grows"; and Hopkins, examining the bear-festival of the Ainu, finds himself at the "very edge of true totemism." Other writers simply describe the Ainu as "bear-worshippers" (Bird, p. 275; Mitra, pp. 468, 469).

³⁵ Reinach thinks that the animal art of paleolithic Europe is indicative of such a development. We have here, he writes, "the first steps of humanity in the path which led to the worship of animals (as in Egypt), then to that of idols in human shape (as in Greece) and, finally, to that of divinity as a purely spiritual conception" (Apollo, p. 8). Lubbock places "animal worship" among the various "nature cults" which occupy the third stage in his reconstruction of religious evolution, when "everything is worshipped indiscriminately" (Appendix, p. 610).

One of the most noteworthy attempts along this line was the interpretation of "totemism" as a religious phenomenon; in fact, the identification of totemism with animal worship. Goldenweiser (1) however, conclusively shows that "the totem, as an object of worship, proves to be perhaps the least permanent and the most variable, qualitatively, of totemic features," so that "totemism as a necessary stage in the development of religion becomes an absurdity, and the concept itself, of totemism as a specific form of religion, ought to be abandoned" (p. 264.)

qualities or stand in some special relation to man, which inevitably and everywhere must stimulate his imagination to reverential attitudes and behavior. Thus, Frazer believes this differential factor to be the emotion of fear, which the qualities and behavior of certain animals stir up in the mind of primitive man.³⁶ For King³⁷ and Toy³⁸ it is the recognition in certain creatures of mysterious or superior capabilities which inclines man to select them as objects of reverence. Frazer conjointly emphasizes the correlation between economic dependence on specific animals and propitiation of their "spirits."³⁹ Thomas, Toy, and Morris also refer to the economic relation as a determining element,⁴⁰

³⁶ Frazer—(part II, Taboo) develops this theory in connection with his compilations of hunting taboos. He says that just as the fear of the souls of slain enemies prompts the savage to certain propitiatory acts the same sort of motive urges him to "propitiate the spirits of the animals he has killed," because, like man, animals are "endowed with souls and intelligence." "While the savage respects, more or less, the souls of all animals, he treats with particular deference the spirits of such as are either especially useful to him or formidable on account of their size, strength, or ferocity accordingly, the hunting and killing of these valuable or dangerous beasts are subject to more elaborate rules and ceremonies than the slaughter of comparatively useless and insignificant creatures" (pp. 190-191). Cf. part V, vol. II, pp. 208, 237, 273).

³⁷ I. King, p. 247, accepts the animistic world view of early man, and therefore animals, as well as persons, may come to be regarded as deities because of "powerful and mysterious" qualities.

³⁸ Toy argues that "of all non-human natural objects it would seem to have been the animal world that most deeply impressed early man." Not only did close association with them give ample opportunity for the observance in animals of qualities similar to those possessed by man (swiftness, courage, ferocity, skill, and cunning), but "in certain regards they appeared to be his superiors, and thus became standards of power and objects of reverence" (pp. 104-5). Hence, the necessity for obtaining their good will. This was especially true for those most important for safety and convenience. "These, invested with mystery by reason of their power and their strangeness, were held in great respect as quasi-gods, were approached with caution, and thus acquired the character of sacredness."

Marett differs from these writers in that he does not use the impression of oddness or uncanniness which he believes certain animals created on the mind of primitive man as a factor which of itself elevated them into a religious category. The odd or uncanny qualities which they display are, from the point of view of his theory, an indication of the operation of "mana" and it is their possession of this power and not mere oddness or uncanniness itself which evokes the religious attitude.

³⁹ Frazer, *op. cit.*

⁴⁰ N. W. Thomas maintains that propitiation of animals is in proportion to their economic importance (p. 515). Toy holds that originally all beasts were sacred but

the assumption being that a sense of usefulness led early man to develop religious attitudes and practices toward the animals on which he habitually depended for sustenance.

One of the essential weaknesses of theories, such as the foregoing, which so often have been offered to explain the origin of the attitudes which primitive man entertains toward the animal kingdom at large or particular members of it, has been the transformation of rather plausible descriptive generalizations into what are deemed to be explanations of the phenomena in question. "Animism," for example, as a description of an attitude toward the faunal world, is valid enough as a general statement, but it does not explain or elucidate for us the veneration of any particular species. A similar fallacy lurks in the theory that animals which are "feared," or considered more powerful than man, or dangerous to him, are revered or worshipped for these reasons. The same criticism applies to an emphasis upon the economic relationship as a causal factor. It is perfectly true, of course, that in certain cases animals which are useful, or feared, or thought to possess superhuman capabilities, are propitiated and held in special esteem, but this descriptive correlation is far from being a universal one, and, without a consideration of alternative possibilities, cannot be used to prove a causal relationship.

The use of broad and vaguely defined categories for purposes of classification, as, for example, "animal worship," also serves to obscure fundamental problems. At first glance they appear to be useful because the emphasis is upon similarities, and, although these are generally of the most superficial character, yet, when data are assembled from peoples in all parts of the world, the general effect is apt to be impressive. But such descriptive

that "gradually those most important for man are singled out as objects of special regard. . . . Since animals are largely valued as food changes in the animals especially honored follow on changes in economic organization" (p. 108).

Morris argues that "in general, the worship of animals seems to support our contention that human nature reverences the 'source whence all our blessings flow'—nay, often reveres as gods the very blessings themselves. . . . When we find the hunter's god in the form of a wild animal and the fisher worshipping his fish, we are prepared to look for sacred cattle among pastoral peoples. Nor are we disappointed" (p. 410).

categories soon turn into ready made catch-alls, into which customs and attitudes are hastily thrust without a previous study of their integration in the cultural patterns from which they have been taken. Nor is due weight given to the diverse historical background of the cultures from which they come, nor to their appearance at epochs widely separated in time. Furthermore, a classification on the basis of similarity generally causes differences in customs and beliefs to be ignored, minimized, or glossed over. Indeed, the unsatisfactory character of these broad classifications of cultural phenomena, and the theoretical deductions which are so often based upon them, become more and more apparent, the closer one grapples with the data of specific cultures in their totality.

To understand, for example, the position of animals in the thought of any one people is far from an easy task.⁴¹ Just as, economically, all of the animals of a people's habitat are not considered of equal importance, it is likewise found that in subjective valuation, and particularly in their association with magico-religious concepts, some creatures rank much higher than others. Moreover, those which are of major importance economically, are not always the creatures which enter most intimately into the magico-religious pattern of the group,⁴² while in other

⁴¹ Hose and MacDougall (1), e.g., have essayed this for a section of Borneo. While not the final word yet it shows the possibilities of such a study in assembling data from this point of view.

⁴² The seal, e.g., on the Northwest Coast of America or the beaver in Labrador. Czaplicka (4), p. 495: It is "curious and hard to explain why the reindeer, which plays such a unique rôle in the life of the Paleo-Siberians is neither worshipped nor venerated and does not in any way enter into the religious life of the people except as a sacrificial animal. In the case of the horse which occupies a similar position among the inhabitants of Central Asia it is quite the reverse." In respect to the reindeer Czaplicka's statement requires some qualification. Mr. H. V. Hall, e.g., points out that "in a tale of the Taz Yurak the hero, a shaman, drives four bucks sacred to one of the chief Gods. They draw a sledge which carries the images of the gods. The reindeer which draw the sledge containing the image of this god must be driven only by a shaman and 'one cannot drive them for fun.' In another tale the only possessions of a young shaman are two reindeer, each sacred to one of two of the greater gods. They are 'wonderful reindeer,' marked by peculiarities of the antlers. In the other story the deer are white and when the shaman drives them into the sea it freezes before them as their hoofs touch the surface. The devotion of reindeer to the gods in fact seems closely to resemble the similar practice with regard to horses in the south."

cases there may be a high degree of correlation.⁴³ In the artistic sphere the animals which appear most conspicuously as decorative motifs may or may not be the same ones which figure prominently in mythology or upon which economic dependence is placed.⁴⁴ Again, there may or may not be a correlation between these creatures and those to which are attributed the most powerful supernatural attributes. Each culture exhibits its own peculiar combination of features which cannot be deduced from any general principles of association. It is only as we comprehend specific cultures in terms of their own range of values and concrete expressions that the rôle of animals in their life and thought becomes intelligible. Only in this setting do qualitative terms such as fear, respect, reverence, regard, worship, etc., have any real force as descriptions of subjective attitudes toward the animal world. It is the reverse of this process of detailed cultural analysis, that has led to the hasty classification of data and broad interpretative generalizations which, plausible enough in some cases and of some value as working hypotheses, are, nevertheless, found to be useless to either describe or explain the differential features of specific cultures.

Another point which needs emphasis, is suggested by an examination of the attitudes manifested toward nature and the animal world in particular cultures. This is the fact that man does not envisage natural phenomena afresh, but looks out upon the animal and plant life of his environment, the solar bodies, and all the rest of the world about him, through the cultural spectacles with which the accident of birth has provided him.⁴⁵ For man at

⁴³ E.g. the buffalo of the Zoda or horses among the Khirgiz.

⁴⁴ Laufer (1), p. 5: "It is indeed most remarkable that animals such as the bear, the sable, the otter, and many others which predominate in the household economy and are favorite subjects in the traditions as well as in daily conversation, do not appear in art, whereas the ornaments are filled with Chinese mythological monsters which are but imperfectly understood." In the art of the Northwest Coast of America on the other hand there is a close parallelism to be noted between the animals which appear in folk-lore and mythology and those which appear as decorative motifs. Some of these are of economic importance, others, such as the shark, are not.

⁴⁵ Yet Hose and McDougall (1), e.g., entirely overlook, or at least grossly underestimate this cultural factor when they conclude from their survey of customs and beliefs regarding animals in Sarawak that (omitting the sacrificial animals) these

primitive culture levels, except perhaps in a past too remote for speculation, "Nature" as we in our sophistication like to abstract it, never exists as a stimulus, unaccompanied by a host of traditional associations, the individual items of which have their historical roots in a still more remote past. Every culture, then, whatever its chief or outstanding characteristics may be, includes some traditional way of interpreting natural phenomena which typifies it. Once a mode of interpretation becomes established in the cultural tradition of a group, it tends to dominate the minds of individuals exposed to it and supplies them with characteristic reaction patterns to all the various types of natural phenomena which they find in the world about them.

Therefore, the explanation of customs and beliefs by some simple psychological formula, couched in terms of "individual psychology," whether applied to origins or later developments, is putting the cart before the horse. That is to say, a specific practice or belief, whether found in one tribe or many, never represents a direct psychological response of individuals to some aspect of the outer world.⁴⁶ The cultural *milieu* too early conditions the subjective attitudes, as well as the overt behavior of individuals, for this to be possible. The source of their beliefs and practices is, therefore, the historic tradition (culture), and the history of particular customs and beliefs must be pursued at the cultural, not the psychological, level.

The possibility of convergent development of similar customs and beliefs in different cultures, owing not to the psychic unity of man, but to the concept that similar end results may come from diverse antecedents, is also ignored. The belief that animals have souls, the selection of animal eponyms for social groupings, the propitiation of the spirits of animals, etc., may conceivably have developed in human thought more than once, and from different

may all be explained as a "direct and logical reaction of the mind of the savage to the impression made upon it by the behavior of the animals" (p. 100). Thus while neatly disposing of decadent totemism as an explanation of these customs and beliefs, the substitution of their own hypothesis is too naively psychological to offer a more satisfactory interpretation.

⁴⁶ Vide Bartlett, pp. 8-13, for a critical discussion of the fallacy on which this notion is based.

premises or historical settings. Nor is it necessary to assign specific customs or general attitudes toward animals to an early culture level in the history of all peoples, as a characteristic stage of thought or religion. It is more likely that a great many of the differences we observe in our empiric data regarding animals in human history, are due to the fact that they arose at different epochs, in different places, and under different cultural conditions. If there is any plausibility in this view, it affords another argument against superficial classification of data and unitary explanations.

On the other hand, similarities, where actually shown to exist, particularly if they occur in contiguous areas, may be due to diffusion or common historical antecedents. For this reason the geographical distribution of various customs and beliefs is of prime importance as a preliminary to any deductions concerning their history and development.

Any study, therefore, of man's relation to the animal world may be approached methodologically from two angles. First is the intensive study of animals from the point of view of a particular culture. This would include their utilitarian aspects, the native classification of species, as well as the rôle of animals in mythology, art, magico-religious beliefs, and so forth. While highly desirable, this sort of a study should begin in the field with an ethno-zoological investigation such as Harrington made for the Tewa, as preliminary to the investigation of beliefs and customs. Unfortunately, data of this kind are not available for most primitive tribes.

Second, comparative studies may be made which, on the economic side, bring out the similarities and differences which characterize the use of related species in different cultures. At the psychological level this approach may be utilized to bring out the rôle which the same animals play in different cultures and the similar rôle of different animals. Or, we may start with specific customs and beliefs which are connected with the same, or different, animals in various cultures. If the cultures studied are contiguous, the problem assumes greater significance because there is always the possibility that light may be thrown upon the historical connections of these cultures.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF PROBLEM
TO BE INVESTIGATED

In view of the emphasis which has been given the psychological interpretation of the origin of customs and beliefs connected with animals, it seems to the writer that comparative studies are of the utmost importance—particularly where the rôle of the same species can be studied in different cultures, and over a considerable geographical area. We can secure by this means some insight into the differential factors which have influenced cultural development, while at the same time the problem of historical relationships of the peoples studied may, to some extent, be elucidated.

Our investigation is of this type and but one animal—the bear—has been taken as the focus of attention. What justification is there for this apparently arbitrary selection?

Attention has been called, more than once, to the prominent rôle which the bear plays in the customs and beliefs of certain peoples of North America, Asia, and Europe. Frazer and de la Saussaye, indeed, have quite boldly grouped the tundra and forest folk of these regions together from this point of view. "The reverence of hunters for the bear which they regularly kill and eat," says the former, "may thus be traced all along the northern region of the Old World, from Bering Strait to Lappland. It reappears in similar form in North America."⁴⁷ Other writers have stressed the reverential attitude of the northern Asiatic peoples toward the bear,⁴⁸ or have grouped with them European peoples having analogies in ideas or customs.⁴⁹ Attention has also been

⁴⁷ *Golden Bough* part v, vol. II p. 224. Frazer bases his view on a rather scattered but very suggestive collection of data. De la Saussaye (p. 98) discussing "animal worship," says, "Among the northern races of Europe, Asia, and America, we must mention the bear." There is practically no documentation for this statement. Cf. N. W. Thomas, 502-4.

⁴⁸ Czaplicka (4), p. 495, (6), p. 138. "Throughout Siberia the bear is either actually an object of worship or at least of reverence which approaches an attitude of worship." Labbè, p. 228: "all the people of Siberia, although different, have a similar veneration for the bear." Middendorf iv, p. 1616: "Überall in Sibirien erweist man dem Bären göttliche Ehre."

⁴⁹ Mitras, e.g. refers to the bear worship "which prevails among the Ainos, the Ostiaks, the Tunguses, the Finns, and other hyperborean peoples of the Old World. . . ." Comparetti (note pp. 305-6) from the depths of his Finnish studies

drawn to specific customs, similar in North America and Asia,⁵⁰ as well as to the general attitude of respect manifested toward the bear in both regions,⁵¹ while to one early writer, at least, certain American customs immediately suggested Finnish analogies.⁵²

Taken singly, the analogies in bear rites and beliefs pointed out by any one of the foregoing writers are, on the whole, of a rather superficial order. They are an excellent illustration of a hasty grouping of attitudes and practices, based, it is true, upon observed similarities, but at the same time drawn largely from unanalyzed fragmentary data. Collectively, however, these observations serve to draw attention to the very significant fact that many of the native tribes of North America, Asia, and Europe do exhibit toward the bear an attitude which, in contrast to that manifested toward other creatures, is more or less unique in character. Testimony to this effect is available in the accounts of explorers, travelers, and ethnologists who have sojourned with these peoples and there is a surprising agreement in the statements of those who have had only the most superficial contacts with the natives and of those who give us accounts based on lengthy residence and intensive study. Of course the terms used to describe the psychological attitude of these aborigines toward the bear vary considerably. Some describe it as respect, others as reverence, veneration, or worship, but one and all are in agreement that, among the animals, bears are held in special esteem. To this extent Frazer's statement is well supported.

It seems justifiable, therefore, to subject to a more intensive investigation than has heretofore been attempted, the beliefs

draws upon data from the Voguls, Votyaks, Samoyeds, and Lapps to help elucidate the beliefs and customs pertaining to the bear in the Kalevala. Pallas (Trusler, p. 317), referring to the Ostyak, says, "Some such customs are prevalent in Lappland. All, or most of these superstitious customs, are the same among all old Siberian pagans."

⁵⁰ Morice (4), p. 171-2, notes that it is customary to place the skull of a bear upon a stump or tree out of the reach of defiling animals, as does Fallaize, p. 879.

⁵¹ Fallaize, p. 879, Frazer, de la Saussaye, op. cit.

⁵² Tailhan, the editor of N. Perrots' *Memoir* (See Blair, I, p. 132): "The customs of Finland also establish the great honors paid to the bear slain by the hunters—a usage doubtless originating in various countries from the terror which this powerful animal inspires, and from the benefits obtained by the family from hunting it."

and customs in the tribes which superficially seem to exhibit such a homogeneous attitude toward the bear. How, indeed are we to account for such notable similarities in psychological attitudes toward a particular animal over such an enormous extent of territory? Are we to believe that the human mind has everywhere reacted to the characteristics of the genus *Ursus* in a similar or even identical fashion, or are other factors of a different order responsible? And if so, what are they?

Fortunately, we do not have to depend upon mere statements of attitude toward the bear, suggestive as these may be. A much more tangible basis of approach to the fundamental problems involved is afforded by the complex of customs of which bears are the object among the peoples who inhabit the regions already mentioned. The manner in which the animals are hunted, certain rites observed in connection with the carcass and the consumption of the flesh, as well as the conventional treatment of the bones, furnish us with objective data which may be analyzed and compared in the various tribal groups and cultures. It is the similarities which have been noted in many of these practices, as well as the general esteem in which the animal is held, that suggested the grouping of peoples, pointed out by the writers mentioned.

It is our intention, therefore, to survey bear ceremonialism in its widest aspects among the peoples of both North America and Eurasia, with a view to determining the geographical distribution of genuine similarities in customs and beliefs, as well as to indicate the significant differences which are to be found in the various tribes and culture areas.

In a broad comparative survey such as this, there are, of course, inherent difficulties and limitations. Perhaps the most outstanding of these is the unevenness of the data available for different regions. This makes any interpretation of the evidence from a broad historico-geographical standpoint exceedingly tentative. At the same time it must be borne in mind that the customs and beliefs under review have suffered, in some regions, a total eclipse by the rapid diffusion of European ideas in the last few centuries. In many cases this reduces our sources of information to literary records, which can no longer be supplemented by field inquiry.

The Finns offer an excellent illustration of this condition. But, there are other peoples who either still practice some of the customs discussed, or retain a knowledge of them. It is from such peoples that future field investigations may yield information which will serve to support or contradict my conclusions, and one of the purposes of such an introductory survey as this, is, I take it, to stimulate just such lines of inquiry.

A further difficulty involves the presentation of the evidence. When dealing comparatively with material culture, photographs, sketches, or a mere statement, together with the proper documentation, is sufficiently convincing. When one is dealing with human activities, however, the matter is far less simple. Consequently, while in the text I have stated that this or that is done, in the footnotes I have often quoted at length the observer's statement, so that the reader may be furnished with some material for independent judgment without having to consult the sources in every case. In my condensation of the Ainu and Gilyak ceremonies, I have similarly given liberal quotations and what I believe to be a fairly exhaustive documentation of the subject. This procedure will, I hope, counteract any unconscious bias in the selection of the material discussed in the text.

So far as conscious selection goes, I have, to some extent, been guided by the data available, insofar at least as attention is primarily focused upon certain outstanding groups of customs and beliefs. The material collected upon these subjects is treated in separate sections, from the comparative viewpoint. In each case the data for the peoples of northeastern North America are given first. This is followed by moving westward to other American tribes and then passing to Asia, where, after a review of the customs of the northeastern peoples, we finally turn to the inhabitants of western Siberia and northern Europe.

As the rites connected with bears (the periodic festivals of the Amur-Gulf of Tartary region excepted) are performed ordinarily as an integral part of the hunt, I have led up to the more distinctly ceremonial features connected with the dead bear through a discussion of the hunt itself, the peculiar linguistic synonymy which so many peoples have for the beast, as well as the custom of

talking to the animal in a conciliatory manner. These features throw considerable light upon the subjective side of our general subject and their geographical distribution is also of significance.

I have, moreover, endeavored to show in how far the customs surveyed are distinctive of the attention paid to bears and in how far they are also associated with other animals in the various cultures.

Finally, I shall attempt an interpretation of bear ceremonialism considered in its widest historico-geographical aspects. Its association with a number of other culture traits of Eurasiatic-American distribution will be pointed out, a fact which will afford us a better clue to possible historical deductions than any interpretations in psychological or economic terms.

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF BEARS

In order to obtain a faunal perspective in approaching our problem, let us first turn for a moment to the essential facts regarding the distribution of bears throughout the world and the probable history of the family. The close relationship of the species inhabiting Eurasia and North America since Pleistocene times is specially worthy of note.

The geographical distribution of the Ursidae is almost exclusively Holarctic. "There is but one African species, confined to the northwest corner of that continent, and one in the Andes of Peru and Ecuador, all others belonging to Eurasia and North America."⁵³ The family is presumably of Eurasian origin and may have reached America in the lower Pliocene, but it is rare until the late Pleistocene,⁵⁴ the period of most importance in the gradual displacement of ancient American types by mammalian migrations from Asia.⁵⁵ In fact, the Boreal mammals of North America and the northern zone of Eurasia resemble each other so closely that

⁵³ Scott, p. 548. The sun bear (*Ursus malayanus*) and the Tibetan blue bear (*U. pruinosus*) are southern species which might be added. For species assigned to other genera of the family, see Beddard, pp. 442-4.

⁵⁴ Scott, p. 518, cf. Trotter p. 4.

⁵⁵ Osborn (2), p. 438, Trotter pp. 3-5.

some authorities⁵⁶ consider the area of their distribution as constituting a single primary region. "It is thus probable," says Allen,⁵⁷ "that most of the more northern types of mammal life on the two continents are the slightly modified descendants of types which formerly had a continuous circum-arctic distribution, which have become slowly differentiated, probably mainly since since the disruption of the former land connection at Bering Straits."

In North America there are upwards of twelve species of bears north of Mexico, the most important and widely distributed of these being *Ursus Americanus* (the common black or brown bear) and *Ursus horribilis* (the grizzly bear).⁵⁸

In Siberia there is *Ursus arctos*,⁵⁹ which resembles the grizzly and big brown bears of America. The members of this species chiefly inhabit the forested regions, appearing, however, on the tundra in summer to feed on berries and moulting water fowl and sometimes ascend into the mountains to escape the mosquitoes and to hunt wild reindeer.⁶⁰ The European brown bear belongs to the same species.⁶¹

⁵⁶ Merriam and others. A similar statement might be made regarding the Arctic fauna of North America, Asia and Europe, in which zone the characteristic mammals differ more from the forms farther south than from each other.

⁵⁷ pp. 182-183; cf. Scharff, p. 85.

⁵⁸ Hegner, p. 652. For the distribution of the American species, see Thompson-Seton, maps 55 and 56. Merriam, relying almost exclusively on cranial characters, lists fifteen species in the grizzly-brown bear group alone.

⁵⁹ Anthropologically speaking, this species is first identified during Chellean and early Acheulean times (Osborn (1), p. 147). In the opinion of some authorities (see Beddard p. 442) a large number of species of bears separately distinguished may better be regarded as "slight modifications" of *Ursus Arctos*, e.g., "the grizzly of North America, the Isabelline Bear, the Syrian Bear, a bear from Algeria, the Kamschatkan and Japanese bears, besides the extinct *Ursus fossilis* of Pleistocene caves." For a good diagrammatic representation of the relationship of Pleistocene bears, see Obermaier, fig. 18.

⁶⁰ Jochelson (2); p. 13.

⁶¹ Flower and Lydekker, p. 559, Beddard, p. 442.

HIBERNATION HABITS OF THE SPECIES AND ASSOCIATED FOLK-BELIEFS

The hibernation of the bear during the winter months is a distinguishing habit of the animal⁶² and the fact that the beast collects no food to sustain itself during this period has evidently impressed the mind of northern hunters everywhere as a mysterious phenomenon. As an old Abenaki said to me, "A bear is wiser than a man because a man does not know how to live all winter without eating anything." This fact is explained over a wide area by a curious bit of folklore. It is said that the bear gets nourishment by sucking its own paws.

The earliest records of this belief are to be found in two accounts dating from the eighteenth century. Charlevoix, after describing in some detail the manner in which the bear hibernates and assuring us that the animal neither eats nor drinks during this period says, "qu'il tire alors de ses Pattes, en les lèchant, une substance, qui le nourrit, comme quelques-uns l'ont avancé: c'est sur quoi il est permis a chacun de croire ce qu'il voudra."⁶³

⁶² Flower and Lydekker, p. 559. Ernest Thompson Seton discusses the hibernation habits of North American bears. Black bear, II, pp. 1064-1066. Dens "vary from a deep, snug, sheltered natural cave in the rocks, to a hollow tree or a hole under an upturned root. Sometimes the bear digs a den in the level ground . . . and sometimes it makes a bed under a windfall of logs and brush, or in a dense thicket. But, wherever chosen, it is sure to be a dry place where the snow will gather and lie deep all winter." Adult bears never den together. Grizzly, *Ibid.*, p. 1046; Wright (2), pp. 79-82; Wright (1), pp. 211-213; the Polar Bear (*Ursus maritimus*) "dig holes in which they remain for sometime, but there is no hibernation" (Beddard, p. 443). This species is sometimes referred to as a separate genus, *Thalarctos maritimus*, but this is not necessary (*ibid.*).

⁶³ p. 117. The quotation is from Letter VI and is dated March 1721 at Three Rivers. From internal evidence it seems fairly certain that Charlevoix is describing the hunting practices and beliefs of Algonkian peoples, but it is impossible to localize any of his statements. That he knew something at first hand about the eastern tribes is not to be disputed but it is also evident that he did not hesitate to draw upon the accounts of other observers, when convenient, and without acknowledgment. In one passage, e.g. (p. 118), where he describes certain practices connected with killing a bear, it is abundantly evident from the sequence of ideas, the details given, and even the phraseology, that Charlevoix has practically copied an earlier account of Perrot (Blair I, p. 129) who is describing these observances among the Central Algonkians. In support of our assertion we have Tailhan's statement (see Blair, I, p. 29) that Charlevoix had access to Perrot's MS. although the latter was not published until 100 years

Lahontan refers to the same belief as follows: "Many People will hardly believe that these animals can live three months in such Prisons, without any other Food but the Juice of their Paws which they suck continually: and yet the matter of Fact is undeniably true."⁶⁴ Lahontan does not specify any particular tribal group to which this belief pertains but refers to it in his general account of the Indians. We know that he was well acquainted with both Iroquois and Algonkians, from the region of the St. Lawrence River to the Great Lakes. It seems permissible, therefore, to infer from these two early references that the belief referred to had a considerable geographical prevalence among the eastern and perhaps central Algonkian tribes in the eighteenth century. It may have been shared by the Iroquois, also. This fact is, to some extent, borne out by the contemporary provenience of the notion among the Montagnais-Naskapi,⁶⁵ Tête de Boule,^{65a} Micmac,⁶⁶ Penobscot,⁶⁷ Malecite,⁶⁸ and St. Francis Abenaki⁶⁹ peoples and a somewhat analogous belief

after Charlevoix's work had appeared. As we do not find any reference to paw sucking in Perrot we may, perhaps, assume that this was picked up orally by Charlevoix himself and, if so, probably refers to eastern Indians and not to central Algonkians, but of this we cannot be certain.

⁶⁴ Voyages, II, p. 484.

⁶⁵ Baptiste Picard (Naskapi of Seven Island), Pitabano (Ungava Band). As evidence the former said that when the animals come out in the spring their paws are very tender; also related the story of a child found by a bear. The animal took it to live with him for three years. The child received its nourishment during the winter in the same way as the animal. Jos. Kurtness attributed the same belief to the Mistassini Indians.

^{65a} Information, D. S. Davidson. They say the animal eats the skin off the palms of its fore-paws.

⁶⁶ Communication, W. D. Wallis.

⁶⁷ Information, F. G. Speck from Hemlock Joe, who said he did not believe it, but everyone said it was so. It is also said that bears hold the soles of their feet toward the entrance of their dens to keep people from finding them.

⁶⁸ Information, F. G. Speck from Gabe Paul. There is a well-known saying among these people, as well as the Penobscot, which illustrates the prevalence of the belief. To a person who has wasted his time during the summer and saved up nothing for the winter it is often said (Penobscot-dialect), "*nodad a man pad' in padji' pun,*" "Let him suck his paws all winter." The above informant also stated that the lumbermen of the Maine woods give credence to the idea. It seems likely that their contacts with the Indians represent the source of the belief.

⁶⁹ Louis Gill (formerly chief and now deceased) told the writer that the bear

among the Caughnawaga Iroquois.⁷⁰ For the Saulteaux,⁷¹ a similar belief is to be found in Peter Grant's account (ca. 1804). An early description of the Ottawa⁷² refers to a variant notion that the bear gets nourishment by sucking its navel instead of its paws. The belief in paw sucking is also recorded from Alberta (Canada), possibly for the Cree⁷³ and from the headwaters of the Columbia River.⁷⁴

In Asia we have this belief reported for the Kamchadal⁷⁵ and

lives on its own fat by sucking its paws. There is a foam observable on the back of the animal's paws which gives evidence of it. Gill had a cub once which did this continually, accompanied by a sort of "purring." When a lot of foam had accumulated he swallowed it. If a bear did not do this his stomach would dry up as there is never anything in it when the animals are found early in the spring. The rectum is stopped up during the winter by "*K'paihigan*." As soon as the animal leaves its den this "stopper" is passed and the creature is then ravenously hungry. Among the Montagnais-Naskapi it is said that the bear "places a dottle of moss and earth in its rectum to prevent soiling the lair (MS. F. G. Speck).

⁷⁰ The evidence of this comes from the notes of Dr. Speck who once heard Margaret Monick (of Mohawk descent) say to her son, "You ain't doin' nothin'." His reply was, "Well, I'll be like the bear—stay in a hole and suck my heel." Charlevoix, it may be noted, visited the reservation on which these people still live.

⁷¹ Masson. As the book is not easily accessible I quote the full statement, p. 345. "The Indians assert, as an undoubted fact, that during these long months these animals take no nourishment of any sort but what they derive from licking their paws, and yet turn out in the spring just as fat as they were when they entered their winter quarters."

⁷² N. Perrot quoted by Blair, I, 49, and note 22, p. 48, in which Tailhan says that Perrot is here speaking of the Ottawa.

⁷³ Somerset, p. 76. Reference is also made to the fact that in the early spring "the under surface of the foot is sore and inflamed." There is not any assignment of the belief in this case to a particular tribal group. The author traversed the region from Ft. Edmonton (Alberta) to Ft. George (B.C.) with a Cree guide and met Beaver and Sekanis bands. He may have heard it either from Algonkians, Athabascans, or both.

⁷⁴ Probably a Salish speaking people. See de Smet's reference in a letter dated Sept., 1845, from this region. He says that the bears hibernate for four months and that the Indians maintain that they suck one paw each month (Thwaites, Vol. 29, p. 207).

⁷⁵ Krashenninnikoff, p. 103. As nothing but a "frothy slime" is found in the stomachs of bears killed in the spring it is thought that the animal "supports himself by sucking his paws." Also James Cook, p. 1079.

Ainu;⁷⁶ in Europe for the Lapps,⁷⁷ in an account dating from the middle of the eighteenth century.

Although the scattered distribution of this belief necessitates caution in drawing any conclusions from the data at hand, it seems to me that its provenience is of positive significance. As will appear in the course of this study, there is a rough correlation between the distribution of this bit of folklore and the occurrence of bear ceremonialism; that is to say, although the belief in question is not reported from *all* the regions where the latter is found, it is *only* recorded from the general districts where some such practices are found *and nowhere else*.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Batchelor (1), p. 472. Some of the Yezo aborigines claim that when bears come out in the spring their feet are so tender that they cannot move far from their dens. Others deny this (p. 473). There is some variety in the notions held regarding how they keep alive. The author says that although many bear hunters assured him that the dens of the beast were always perfectly clean inside, yet there are beliefs current which explain matters by saying that the animals "store up fish and vegetables in their dens, and devour them in the winter; others that they eat earth; and others, again, that before they return to their dens in the autumn, they open up ants' nests by scratching them, and trample upon the insects, thus causing thick layers of ants and their eggs, all mashed up together, to adhere to their forefeet. They lick their feet when awake during the winter months . . . and so keep themselves alive and fat."

Torii, p. 255, relates a narrative of the Kurile Ainu regarding the adventures of a hunter who lost his way in the woods and took refuge in a bear's den. He lived for some time with the animal, receiving nourishment and drink by sucking the bear's paws.

⁷⁷ Leems (see Pinkerton, vol. 1, p. 415): "It is a matter well known and ascertained through the regions of the north that a bear, during the winter, lies concealed in his den and that he is there sustained by no other aliment than a certain milky juice which he sucks from his fore paws with a growling." Acerbi repeats this statement almost word for word. Instead of "region of the north" he cites it as "a prevailing opinion in the countries of northern Europe." He does not specify them, but, taking the statement at its face value, we might be led to suppose that both authors intended perhaps to include other peoples beside the Lapps in their generalization.

⁷⁸ As a check upon the peculiar northern distribution of the belief it may be well to state here that consultation with Dr. J. R. Swanton and Dr. F. G. Speck, as well as a search of the literature, has not revealed any trace of it among the southeastern Indians. Inquiry among survivors of the Virginian tribes has yielded a similar negative result. Chief Bass, e.g., of the Nansamun tribe, whose present location is near the Dismal Swamp, never heard of such a notion, although even to this day bears are constantly hunted. (Even in this southerly region bears hibernate about four weeks in January or February, crawling into a hollow tree.) Dr. E. C. Parsons has never

In some cases one might suspect European influences as the source of the belief,⁷⁹ but in view of the fact that such early observers as Charlevoix and Lahontan in America and Captain King and Krashennnikoff in Siberia (Kamchadal) recorded it as a native notion, this seems unlikely. It would be strange if they had taken the trouble to record such an item in their correspondence if it had not appealed to them as novel and un-European. We should expect, moreover, to find its distribution much wider in extent.

If, on the other hand, we consider the possibility that we have here an example of convergent development in the growth of a belief, a parallel attempt to explain why the bear can live during its hibernation without food, it seems to me that we are delivering ourselves up to an improbable theory of psychic accidents. To those who incline to this view we might put the question: Why is it that this belief is limited to an area so much smaller than that in which bears hibernate? Furthermore, if we resort to independent development as an explanation, why not assume that the belief arose independently in *every* case? From this standpoint, even admitting a limited diffusion, at least four centers of origin must be hypothecated (eastern North America, western North America, northeastern Siberia, northern Europe). In my opinion it seems much more likely to be an ancient notion which is associated with other customs connected with bears in both the Old World and the New.

THE BEAR HUNT⁸⁰

TIME OF ATTACK

Bear hunters in both the New World and the Old show a common tendency toward the adjustment of their hunting prac-

heard the belief expressed by any of the peoples of the Southwest and as far as I have been able to discover, in consultation with Drs. Boas, Sapir, Barbeau, and Frachtenberg, it does not occur among the North Pacific Coast tribes.

⁷⁹ Mr. Skinner has heard it from whites, as has Mr. Cadzow in Loucheux territory, but the borrowing in these cases may be in the opposite direction as seems to be the case in Maine, where lumbermen who have long been in close touch with the Indians entertain the idea.

⁸⁰ As we stated in our introductory discussion, the hunting of an animal is, in many primitive cultures, a matter which has its magico-religious side as well as

tices to the hibernatory habit of the animal. The favorite time to hunt the beast is toward the end of the winter, or in the early spring, while snow is still on the ground.⁸¹ The den of the animal

its practical aspect. Consequently, the preparation for the hunt frequently imposes activities upon the hunter which are related to the former series of ideas. Observances and restrictions of this character may even apply to certain members of his family. Such customs vary widely, of course, from group to group and usually are not exclusively associated with any particular animal. The Labrador Indian, e.g., must have favorable dreams before he hunts any animal and the sweat lodge is also a necessary preliminary to bear hunting in this region and among the Tête de Boule although not characteristic elsewhere. Among the Nootka there are a long series of secret rituals which are performed in order to secure power and success in various kinds of undertakings. Hunting is one of these and there are different rituals for different kinds of hunting. "Most of them are accompanied by face painting and prayers and all involve symbolic activities (sympathetic magic) and continence, fasting, rubbing with hemlock branches, and keeping awake for days and nights." The ritual used for bear hunting is specifically individualized, but at the same time follows the characteristic "pattern" (I am indebted to Dr. E. Sapir for the Nootka information.) Because of the lack of unique preparations for a bear hunt, which is characteristic of so many peoples, and the entire absence of data among others, I have not drawn this topic into our discussion for it throws practically no light on our central problem and should receive independent study from a different point of view.

⁸¹ This holds good for the eastern and northeastern Algonkians (cf. Denys, p. 433) who consider it the most advantageous time to hunt bears. For the northern Algonkian a similar practice prevailed; eastern Cree and northern Saulteaux (Skinner [1], pp. 27, 163), northern Cree (Thompson, p. 114), Bungi (Skinner [4], p. 510). The central Algonkian formerly followed the same custom; Menomini (Skinner [5], pp. 187, 189), Kickapoo, Sauk, Prairie, Potawatomi, (verbal information, Mr. Skinner). Among the latter certain men are said "to have power over bears" and "were able to locate their dens in winter when the animals were hibernating" (field notes, Skinner). Bear hunting is a thing of the past among these peoples today, according to the same investigator, and consequently it is difficult to get an accurate account of their hunting customs. The Menomini say (*op. cit.*) that the animal was hunted in the winter because at other seasons it was only met by accident and kept close to the heart of the forest. In Hearne's time the tribes of northern Canada also hunted the bear in its winter retreat (pp. 344-5) cf. Morice (3), vol. 5, p. 116. Mr. Jenness has informed me that this is the practice of the Carrier. According to Mr. Cadzow the Loucheux sometimes sought bears in their dens but this was not a regular practice. Dr. Boas tells me that the tribes of the northwest coast sought out the animal at this season although traps were utilized also to a considerable extent. See also Krause, p. 181 with reference to the Tlingit. cf. northern Maidu, Dixon (3) p. 193.

For the Koryak and other Siberian peoples we have Jochelson's statement (3) p. 555. "In winter the bear is attacked in its den in the manner common throughout Siberia." He says that "in the spring when the bear leaves its lair, it is only killed in self-defense." It is then lean, the skin useless and the animal very dangerous. (*Ibid.* 554). cf. Allen's statements for the Koryak and Tungus (p. 166); Batchelor (p. 473)

can then be located by the discoloration of the snow around its breaking hole or by the vapor arising from it. Sometimes the animal is tracked the previous fall, and its refuge marked, as bears do not usually den until after the first fall of snow. Or the hunters may know the places where the bears of their habitat take refuge year after year. The animal is thus rudely disturbed in its winter sleep before it has a chance to emerge from its retreat. The time of the attack is evidently part of an ancient hunting complex which has grown up around the animal⁸² and with it, in a number of tribes, there seem to be associated some of the most conservative customs and beliefs. As will presently appear, for example, this method of hunting the bear was coupled with the use of certain weapons and a manner of approach which even the introduction of firearms and steel traps did not entirely displace.

METHODS AND WEAPONS

North America

Eastern Woodlands Area.—When a bear is discovered in its winter retreat, or attacked in the woods, it is customary among the Algonkian tribes to dispatch the animal by means of a spear or an axe.⁸³ Although one might expect that upon the introduction of firearms and steel traps, such methods would have fallen into almost immediate decadence, such was not actually the case. Contemporary practice, as well as traditional testimony indicates

Howard (pp. 114-117) and von Siebold (p. 21) for the Ainu, and Niemojouski (i p. 227) for the Tungus and Yakut.

Scheffer says the Lapps located the beasts' den in autumn by tracing the animals' tracks after the first fall of snow, so that in the spring they could go directly to it (p. 38) cf. Pinkerton (Leems) p. 415. Johan Turi gives a realistic account of the methods employed in bear hunting. See p. 116 *seq.* for a description of how the animal is attacked in its winter refuge.

⁸² The nocturnal habits of the bears (Nelson, pp. 437, 440) may have had something to do with this as it would only be by chance, and perhaps infrequently, that they would be met in the woods. Seeking them out in their dens was a procedure which made success almost a certainty and the bear at this time was in a relatively weakened condition.

⁸³ The only reference I have discovered to the use of the bow and arrow in bear hunting by Algonkian tribes is the statement of Denys (p. 433) for the Micmac that when discovered in the open this weapon was used, but even in this case the animal was finally dispatched with an axe.

the use of the more primitive weapons in many instances, even when guns are available. This appears to be due to an inhibition which, although difficult to define except in rather vague terms, seems, nevertheless, to be connected with the whole ideology of which the bear is the focus. It is simply the feeling, conserved from a remote past, perhaps, that in killing a bear the most appropriate weapon for the task must be one of an aboriginal type. The Montagnais-Naskapi as well as the Penobscot, for example, consider it proper to strike the animal with an axe as it emerges from its den.⁸⁴ In the old days the latter people say that sometimes the bear would be attacked in the open by three or four hunters, armed only with their knives lashed on canoe poles or staves. After the animal was brought to bay and surrounded, one of them would throw a freshly cut balsam branch into the beast's clutches. This served to confuse the bear who would start to maul it, giving the hunters time to run him through. If the animal turned in one direction a man from the opposite side would attack, and so on until the bear was overcome.⁸⁵

Among the northern Saulteaux there is a specific prohibition upon shooting bears in their winter lairs. Custom prescribes that the animal be killed by a blow on the head with a club as it emerges from its refuge.⁸⁶ Among the Cree, "in the old days, the hunters engaged the bear in hand to hand conflicts and clubbed it to death, for the bow and arrows were not considered strong enough weapons." "Even at present," Skinner says, "bears caught in steel traps are sometimes killed by striking them over the head with an axe, although they are usually shot."⁸⁷ For the central Algonkian generally, there is traditional information, so Mr.

⁸⁴ Information F. G. S. (ms). Some of the Naskapi hunters however, keep a cocked rifle at their side in case of an emergency.

⁸⁵ This method was described to Dr. Speck by Joe Francis, a Malecite, who was married to a Penobscot woman and lived at Old Town, Me. The Micmac are said by Denys (p. 433) to have used the spear in bear hunting and the St. Francis Abenaki recount the use of a knife lashed to a pole.

⁸⁶ Skinner (1), p. 163.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* (1), pp. 26-7, p. 73. "The Indians affirm that when standing on his hind legs neither the polar nor black bear can well turn on the right side, making it comparatively easy for an agile man to run in closely and stab it to the heart."

Skinner tells me, to the effect that good sportsmanship dictated that the bear should be attacked only with weapons such as the spear or axe.⁸⁸ There was no taboo upon other instruments of the chase, but, because the bear was considered such an unusual sort of animal, it was thought that the use of these weapons was the manly way of attacking the beast. One met it on more common ground, as it were, by this manner of combat.

Consequently, we may infer that before the advent of firearms and even in historic times,⁸⁹ the method of clubbing or spearing the bear in its den or attacking it in the open at close quarters was not an uncommon practice in many Algonkian tribes. The Menomini, for instance, considered that to engage a bear single-handed was considered "as brave a deed as to slay an enemy," and adventurous youths would show their mettle in this way.⁹⁰

Among the Iroquois a similar method of killing bears was in vogue. They considered that there was only one proper method to be employed in killing a bear. This was by a blow from a war club on the animal's forehead. Archeological evidence supports both the wide prevalence and the antiquity of this procedure, as practically all of the bear skulls found in the Iroquois horizons show certain evidence of it.⁹¹

Mackenzie Area.—For the tribes of northern Canada, specific information is lacking, but we may refer to Hearne's general

⁸⁸ It is Skinner's impression that traces of the same attitude are to be found among the Cree. Cf. with statements above.

⁸⁹ Traps of an aboriginal variety were, of course, used as well, upon occasion, to capture bears. Cf. Skinner (5), p. 187-9, for the Menomini. The Wabanaki peoples and the northeastern Algonkians sometimes used dead falls.

⁹⁰ Skinner (5), p. 187, 189.

⁹¹ Information A.C. Parker and A. Skinner. The latter, e.g., recounts the demonstration of a bear killing of the old-fashioned sort, told to him by William Blue Sky, a Seneca, now deceased. This Indian said that years ago when working in the lumber district of Pennsylvania a bear came within sight of their camp. A hue and cry was raised and another Seneca, a rather old man at the time, said he would show them how the Indians used to kill bears. The animal was brought to bay at the foot of a tree with the help of dogs, at which point the Seneca made a speech to the animal (the nature of which is unknown), before clubbing him to death with a tomahawk. The old man then went on to tell them that the Seneca considered that it was always proper to club a bear to death in this way.

statement that in hunting the bear the natives "blocked up the mouth of the den with logs of wood, then broke open the top of it, and killed the animal with a spear or gun." Hearne also says that he heard that a similar method was used by the Kamchadal⁹² and significantly adds that the Indians considered the use of a gun under these conditions both cowardly and wasteful. This seems to suggest a comparable subjective attitude to that previously noted for the Algonkians. Sometimes the natives he refers to, would fasten a snare around the animal's neck and, drawing its head close up to the hole they had made in the top of the lair, would finally dispatch the beast with a hatchet.⁹³ Thè Carrier⁹⁴ used the spear in attacking bears, as did the Loucheux. Among the latter it was esteemed an especially brave act for two or three men to attack the brown bear (not the black) in this manner.⁹⁵ The bow and arrow was also employed by the Carrier.

Plateau and Northwest Coast Areas.—The use of trapping devices for killing bears⁹⁶ and the custom of seeking them out in their winter dens⁹⁷ seems to characterize the bear hunting customs of the natives of the North Pacific Coast and the Salish tribes of the Plateau region. So far as the use of a lance in open combat is

⁹² Hearne's information was undoubtedly correct as we find other northeast Siberian tribes doing so (e.g., the Koryaks and Chukchi, see *passim*.) Cf. Turi's account of the Lapps, p. 117, who also proceed in the same manner. Morice (3), vol. 5, pp. 116-7, says that this method was employed in the case of the grizzly but in hunting the less formidable black species the animal is "dislodged from its lair by especially trained dogs acting as ferrets, and then killed with any weapon at hand." If the bear cannot be gotten out by this method "fire and smoke is then resorted to, always with the most satisfactory results." Grizzlies, he says, were formerly killed by traps, "huge contrivances made of green timber, in the shape of the side of a roof yielding to the action of some figure-of-four device" (p. 126). These were evidently similar to the bear traps of the North Pacific Coast.

⁹³ Hearne, pp. 344-5.

⁹⁴ Information, Mr. D. Jenness (letter Oct. 27, 1924).

⁹⁵ Verbal information, Mr. Donald Cadzow (Museum of the American Indian, New York).

⁹⁶ See Teit (1), p. 226 (Lillooet); (2), p. 522, (Shuswap); (4), pp. 247, 249 (Thompson); Jewitt, p. 97 (Nootka). For the Haida, Curtis, XI, p. 131 (There are no grizzlies on the Queen Charlotte Islands, Swanton [2], p. 416). For the Kwakiutl, Boas (4), pp. 509-10, Curtis, v.x, p. 33. The methods employed by the Tlingit are described in the text.

⁹⁷ See previous note where authorities are given.

concerned, which would compare with the method described for other American peoples and a large number of Siberian tribes yet to be discussed, I have found only a single reference to this procedure in killing the bear.⁹⁸

In his work on the Tlingit, Krause quotes Holmberg⁹⁹ to the effect that bears were hunted only infrequently and then only in case of necessity, owing to the fact that they were considered to be metamorphosed (*verwandelten*) men. Krause comments that this was not true in his time for bears in general, that is to say, the brown bear was avoided, but the black bear was zealously hunted. He emphasizes the seasonal changes in procedure used in killing the latter. It was sought with dogs in its winter den, which was located by the scratches which the animal had made on the bark of the trees in the neighborhood. In summer it was the custom to lie in wait until about sunset, for at this time of day the bear would descend from the mountains to the clearings in the forest (*Waldeslichtungen*) in order to feast upon the young verdure there.¹⁰⁰ In the autumn, when the bears would come to the streams to catch salmon during the night, deadfalls of planks would be constructed near their haunts in order to kill them.¹⁰¹

Eskimo.—The American Eskimo kill the polar bear in the open by spearing the animal with a harpoon or a knife lashed to the end of a pole. The animals are usually run down on foot with the help of dogs.¹⁰²

⁹⁸ Curtis, X, p. 35 says a Wikeno (Kwakiutl) informant born about 1854 has seen a grizzly "killed with a spear, and declares that this was not a rare feat for some men, though few could accomplish it."

⁹⁹ *Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des Russischen Amerika* (*Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, vol. iv, p. 29). I have not been able to consult this work myself.

¹⁰⁰ When bears were killed in the open the bow seems to have been the typical weapon employed (except, of course, European firearms in recent times). See references in note 96.

¹⁰¹ Krause, p. 181.

¹⁰² Jenness, p. 152; Boas (2), p. 507; Nelson (1) writes, p. 121, "Formerly, after bears had been brought to bay by dogs, they were killed with stone or iron pointed lances, and, indeed, the people of the Siberian shore still kill many in this old fashion." Murdock (2), p. 263, only refers to the polar bear being shot with a rifle.

Eurasia

Paleo-Siberians.—In northeastern Siberia, according to Nelson, the natives attack the polar bear in the spring with "short-hafted, long-bladed lances," and the help of dogs. The latter bring the beast to bay, "and the hunter, watching his opportunity, runs in and thrusts the lance through the heart."¹⁰³

The Koryak,¹⁰⁴ when attacking the bear in its den, and also the Chukchi,¹⁰⁵ when hunting the brown bear, block the entrance of the animal's retreat with logs.¹⁰⁶ Then they break in the roof and stab the beast to death with spears, or shoot it. Sometimes snares are used to catch bears. In summer and autumn, the Koryak now kill bears with firearms, whereas formerly they used the bow and arrow. "Not infrequently," however, "they attack the bear with the spear," dogs being used at the same time to worry the animal from the rear.¹⁰⁷

Among the Ainu, guns, spring-bows, or pits set in the trail of bears, the bow and arrow, spears and knives, are reported.¹⁰⁸

Nevertheless, the traces of an *ancien régime* in which bear hunting was an undertaking requiring the utmost skill and courage, are not entirely lacking. It is well expressed in the native saying, "He who undertakes to catch a bear must not cry over his wounds."¹⁰⁹ Consequently, bear hunting was greatly exalted and the typical weapons of the older era were a long knife and a

¹⁰³ Nelson, p. 436. No specific peoples are mentioned. We may suppose that he refers to the Siberian Eskimo and Chukchi. Bogoras, e.g., tells us, (2) p. 141, that when a polar bear is sighted the Chukchi will release two or three dogs from the team. When the animal is overtaken and held at bay, it will be speared with a lance, or shot.

¹⁰⁴ Jochelson (3), p. 555.

¹⁰⁵ Bogoras (2), p. 142.

¹⁰⁶ This is the practice attributed by Hearne to the Kamchadal. They probably did it, although we have been unable to discover any published statement.

¹⁰⁷ Jochelson, *op. cit.*, p. 554.

¹⁰⁸ Batchelor (1), pp. 475-6. See also the Japanese drawings reproduced by Mac Ritchie, pl. 8, figs. 2 and 3. The first shows two Ainu and a dog "in front of the bear's den, at the moment when the bear, emerging from the hole with its cub, is struck in the eye with an arrow. . . ." The second depicts three Ainu attacking a bear in the open. "The animal, struck by an arrow, falls toward an Ainu who receives it on his spear, while a third runs up to his assistance with drawn hunting knife." Cf. von Siebold, p. 20.

¹⁰⁹ Greey, p. 122.

bow and arrow, with which the animal was attacked in its winter refuge.¹¹⁰ The entrance to the den was sometimes blocked, the animal stirred up, and it was knocked on the head or shot as it attempted to get out.¹¹¹ Batchelor says that if the bear cannot be stirred out of its den by prodding, dogs, or smoke, an Ainu armed with nothing but his hunting knife will go in and force the animal to come out. Even when the beast appeared outside, the bow and arrow was not always used, especially when the animal stood upon his haunches at close quarters. "Drawing the knife," an Ainu "rushes into the animal's embrace, hugs him closely and thrusts the knife home into his heart."¹¹² Or a spear will be held in readiness, and when the beast makes a rush at the hunter, the latter will step back a few paces and allow the bear to fall on the spear. They do not attack the animals directly with spears as it is said bears are quick enough to "parry a thrust with their forepaws."¹¹³ When the bear is ceremonially killed in the bear festival, quite a different method is used which will be described later. It may also be noted here that prior to the slaughter of the beast, as part of this event, the animal is usually shot at with blunt arrows.

According to Ravenstein, the lower Amur peoples, in order not to excite the bear's "posthumous revenge," do not surprise him, but have a fair stand-up fight."¹¹⁴ A spear, the head of which is covered with spikes, is laid on the ground. A cord is attached to it, and, as the beast approaches, the hunter raises the weapon and the animal becomes impaled upon it. Other members of the party then rush up and kill the bear.¹¹⁵

For the Gilyak of Saghalin, Labbé refers to the use of spring-bows and guns, but adds that others who are more courageous only

¹¹⁰ Batchelor (1), p. 471. von Siebold (p. 21) observes that "Die Bärenjagd besteht meistens im Aufsuchen des Bären in der Höhle."

¹¹¹ von Siebold, *op. cit.* Holland, p. 241, also mentions the spring cross bow set up in the woods.

¹¹² Batchelor (1), pp. 474-5. Cf. Landor p. 272; Dixon p. 45; Howard 114-7.

¹¹³ Batchelor (1) p. 476.

¹¹⁴ There is a trace here of an attitude of mind analogous to that cited for certain American tribes.

¹¹⁵ Ravenstein, p. 379. Lansdell, without giving this earlier writer credit, quotes him almost word for word in reference to the Gilyak, II, p. 231.

arm themselves with a bow and knife, the latter of which they handle with great skill. The hunters are very proud of their bear-killing record and each man carries in his belt a little stick with a number of notches in it, indicating the number of bears he has killed.¹¹⁶

Neo-Siberians.—Another Siberian traveler, who spent some time among the Yakut and Tungus, says that firearms are held to be of little use in bear hunting, the favorite weapons being the knife and lance.¹¹⁷

The method of bear hunting among the ancient Ostyak is described by Ides who says they are "armed with no other weapon than a sharp iron like a large knife, fixed to a stick, about a fathom long. As soon as they have put up a Bear, they run at him with these short spears" ¹¹⁸ This is precisely the same sort of weapon, according to Mr. H. U. Hall, which the Limpiisk Tungus told him was the only one with which the bear is hunted. "The hunter awaits the attack of the bear, holding the *arkas* with both hands at his right side, the point presented at the middle of the bear's body. The bear's onslaught is met with a powerful forward thrust to help him to impale himself on the blade."¹¹⁹

The Lapps looked upon bear hunting as an especially noble pursuit.¹²⁰ As one writer puts it: "The skill and address necessary

¹¹⁶ Labbe, p. 261.

¹¹⁷ Niemojowski, vol. I, pp. 227-30. The lance consists of a piece of iron on a stick four feet long.

¹¹⁸ p. 21.

¹¹⁹ Mr. Hall was a member of the University of Pennsylvania Museum and Oxford Committee for Anthropology Expedition to Siberia in 1915. His informant was Nikipur (Russian name) Hdigir, elder brother of Piroi (Dmitri) Hdigir, headman of the Limpiisk Tungus, who was a noted hunter. The quotation in the text and the following description are from Mr. Hall's notes.

"The *arkas* has a heavy steel blade about eighteen inches long with a sharp point and one sharp edge. The blade is fixed by a tang into a stout shaft about five feet in length. It is also used by hunters to clear the undergrowth or to blaze a trail in the forest to the place where the carcass of a bear, deer, etc., has been temporarily left."

Middendorff pictures two varieties of this weapon and gives a short description with a few words about its use against the bear. He says that the Russians, Samoyed, and Yakut are as much afraid of the bear as the Tungus are bold in dealing with it." (iv, p. 1378).

¹²⁰ Pinkerton (Regnard), p. 194.

in the pursuit of the bear and its comparative scarcity in Finmark (1827) render the killing of one of these animals the most honorable exploit a Laplander can perform, and is a constant source of triumph to the successful adventurer. The Laplanders have, besides, exalted ideas of the sagacity and talents of the bear, and treat him, in consequence, with a kind of respect and deference, which they do not pay to any other animal."¹²¹

According to Scheffer, the ancient Lapps marched through the forest to the bear's den in a conventional order. In front was the hunter who had discovered the lair in the previous fall, followed by the "drum-beater" (shaman?) and next, the individual who was to make the first attack upon the bear. Having arrived at the animal's retreat the bear was killed by means of firearms, bow and arrow, lances,¹²² or an axe.¹²³ If the last mentioned weapon was employed, the bear was first provoked with sticks or fire until it put its head out of the den. It was then quickly struck dead.¹²⁴ Johan Turi's account of the use of the spear or lance when attacking the bear in the open quite closely parallels Batchelor's description of the use of this weapon by the Ainu and suggests that of other peoples who employ a similar weapon in killing bears. The animal is not attacked directly, but the spear is held in reverse until the beast launches himself against the hunter and thus becomes impaled.¹²⁵

¹²¹ Brooke, p. 184; Scheffer, p. 332 says, "Among all the other wild Beasts of Lapland the Bear challenges the first place, being accounted King of the Woods; Regnard (Pinkerton, I, p. 194) writes that "there is no other animal against which the Laplander wages such a cruel warfare" in order to obtain both the flesh, which is considered a great delicacy, and the skin. The chase of the bear is a solemn action but nothing is more glorious than to kill one, "and they carry evidence of their having done so about with them." One can tell how many bears a Lapp has killed "by the hair of them which he carries in various places of his bonnet."

¹²² Linnaeus, II, p. 63, figures a combination lance and snow staff employed in bear hunting.

¹²³ Pinkerton (Regnard's Journey), p. 194; Scheffer, p. 238; Turi (2), p. 236; although pits were used by the Lapps to trap bears and other animals Reuterskiöld (p. 41) says it was more usual to kill the former in its lair.

¹²⁴ Pinkerton, I, p. 415.

¹²⁵ p. 116. "Mann musz einen Spiesz haben, womit mann den Bären sticht, und er musz auf die Weise gestochen werden, dasz der Spiesz unter dem Arm verborgen ist und der Schaft des Spieszes ganz hinten hinter dem Rücken, und wenn der Bär auf

If we interpret correctly the data which have been brought together by the foregoing survey, they seem to indicate three general types of procedure in bear hunting among the native tribes of northern North America and Eurasia.

1. The animal was sought in its lair and, being forced out by the hunters, was as a rule dispatched with a spear or axe as it emerged, or shot with the bow and arrow.

2. The bear was frequently attacked in the open (even after it came out from its den) in what often amounted to a kind of "hand to hand" combat in which the favorite weapon was the spear or lance. One or more hunters might participate.

3. The beast was trapped by any one of a number of devices, most frequently of the deadfall variety.

The first of these, while practiced by practically all of the northern peoples to a greater or less degree,¹²⁶ is probably everywhere a characteristic method of hunting all of the species of the genus *Ursus* which hibernate. Dr. Swanton, for example, informs me that it was the usual method of hunting bears among the southeastern Indians.¹²⁷ It does not, therefore, distinguish the northern peoples, of North America at least, from their southern congeners. A similar statement might also be made regarding trapping bears, the devices used for this purpose showing the characteristic variations we should expect as we move from one culture area to another.

einen losgeht, dann musz man sich hintenüberwerfen. Dann fällt der Bär in dem Spiesz, und dann musz man ihn herumdrehen und den Spiesz in den Bären hineintreiben und ihn gegen die Erde drücken." Cf. Turi, Lappish Texts, pp. 233-37 for references to the spear.

¹²⁶ Except the Eskimo. The polar bear does not hibernate.

¹²⁷ "They usually hunted the bear before he came forth from his winter quarters in a hollow tree or cave. In the former case, one hunter threw or dropped fire into the hollow and his companions killed the animal after it had been driven forth. In the latter case, some men would go into the cave bearing a torch. If the animal charged toward the entrance, the men would fall flat and let him run out when the man or men left outside would kill him. If he did not offer to run out, they would locate him by the glitter of the light in his eyes, shoot him and drag him outside." Letter from Dr. Swanton, Nov. 4, 1924. Chief Bass of the Nansamund tribe (Virginia) says that bears in this latitude (Dismal Swamp) hibernate in the trees for about four weeks in January or February. The animals are hunted at this period with the aid of dogs and shot.

The spearing method, on the other hand, seems to characterize the northern tribes of both continents, more specifically those peoples who do not practice agriculture or at least have their cultural roots in a hunting economy.¹²⁸

LINGUISTIC TERMINOLOGY FOR THE BEAR

One of the most constant and distinctive practices associated with bears is the custom of referring or speaking to the animal by some other term than the generic name for it. In many instances, in fact, there seems to be a specific prohibition upon the use of the proper name of the beast, especially upon certain occasions. Later, we shall refer to the specific circumstances under which the synonymy for the bear comes into play and which furnishes, as it were, the sociological context for the linguistic usage, but at this point I wish to compare and discuss the linguistic terminology for the bear as a detached phenomenon.

NORTH AMERICA

Algonkian-speaking Tribes

St. Francis Abenaki.—Although hunting is no longer practiced by most members of this tribe, the custom of calling the bear "cousin,"¹²⁹ is known to almost everyone of the older generation of males. It is spoken of in a somewhat light manner at present and is rationalized by referring to the fact that a skinned bear looks very much like a human being in its proportions. It is said that formerly, when evidences of the animal were seen in the woods, the hunters would say, "These are our cousin's tracks." Once, when a bear was seen to fall from a tree, a hunter exclaimed,

¹²⁸ The peoples of the North Pacific Coast of America offer an apparent exception to this generalization, as do those of the Plateau area, but this may, in part, be due to lack of data. In the case of the former the ascendancy of pursuits connected with a littoral existence, and a consequent subordination of hunting, does not offer an essential contradiction to our statement.

¹²⁹ *ḡadangwa's*. The generic term for bear in this dialect is *awasús*. From a comparative point of view this term is of interest because it does not correspond with the most common designation for the bear in other languages of the Eastern-Central group. When it does appear it means "the animal" and may indeed represent an original circumlocution which has become generic.

"Cousin, did you hurt yourself?" The animal got up and ran off before the Indian could shoot. The apology to a killed bear is given what is evidently a secondary explanation, by saying that this is done out of consideration for their "cousin."¹³⁰

Penobscot.—The bear is often called "grandfather."¹³¹ One informant explained this by saying that this meant that the beast was the grandfather of all the animals.¹³²

Montagnais-Naskapi.—Although the generic term for the bear¹³³ may be used before the hunt or in the camp, custom dictates a conventional synonymy upon certain other occasions. In the woods it is desirable to refer to the beast as "black food,"¹³⁴ so that the animal "won't get mad"; when addressed in its den it is called "grandfather" or "grandmother" according to its sex,¹³⁵ and after death "short tail" or "black food".¹³⁶ Other terms are the "big great food,"¹³⁷ "food of the fire" (black remains), "the one who owns the chin."¹³⁸ All of them are considered honorific in character.^{138a}

Eastern Cree.—One of the most important synonyms for the bear in this group is the same as that used by the Montagnais-Naskapi, i.e., "black food."¹³⁹ If a hunter meets a bear in the woods

¹³⁰ Field notes, A.I.H.

¹³¹ *Namus'* *su'más* generic term *awésus*.

¹³² Miss Mary Alice Nelson.

¹³³ *Mácke'w*.

¹³⁴ *Kawilápatc'* *mitcám* (Seven Islands); *kakáctwátc* *mitcám* (Moise); *kaopátc* *mitcamiyu* (Mistassini); *kwactewá* *mitcem* (Escoumains).

¹³⁵ *námo* cum or *nokum*.

¹³⁶ *katágwásocwi* (Seven Islands); *tákáyəwagən* (Mistassini) lit. shortened tail.

¹³⁷ *tstcemitamiyu* (Mistassini).

¹³⁸ *K'tceo* *mitcám* (Seven Islands); and *kawè* *'kwa'kwánit* (Mistassini).

^{138a} Dr. Speck has collected one apparent exception to this rule. In a song of the Michikaman band the bear is called *kanáy ápeunt*, "chicane clown." Its occurrence in this context places it outside the category of other circumlocutions and it is not considered an opprobrious epithet. Comeau (p. 85) writes "when bears are spoken of it is always with great respect. In fact the name is not mentioned but the bear is referred to as 'the black beast' or simply 'the' animal."

¹³⁹ Skinner (1), p. 69. *kawí'pátc* *mitcem*. In referring to the Algonkian bands which Skinner calls "Eastern Cree" it has been convenient to follow his terminology for them, particularly as frequent citations from his publications are made. Nevertheless, the bands which he groups under this rubric (particularly those of Eastmain and Rupert's House) are more correctly classified with the Montagnais-Naskapi peoples

and it is necessary to speak to the bear, this is the term to use, as it is the bear's "proper name, and he will not be offended or frightened by it." It is also the name by which the animal is spoken of when the carcass is being ceremonially treated,¹⁴⁰ although "short tail,"¹⁴¹ another Montagnais-Naskapi correspondence, both linguistically and ceremonially, is permissible after death. It is only permissible to refer to the bear as *muskwa*' (the "angry one" or "wrangler")¹⁴² when the bear is not present "unless one wishes to anger him"¹⁴³ or as an expression of reproof. It must never be used before his carcass."¹⁴⁴ The latter prohibition also applies to the term "crooked tail," which is only used when joking about a bear.¹⁴⁵ When it is desirable not to let the bear know that it is being talked about, other linguistic substitutions are in vogue. One may speak of "old porcupine" or "the cat or lynx-like creature."¹⁴⁶

Tête de Boule.—When hunters approach a bear's den the generic term (*maskwâ*) is taboo. The animal is called "grandfather" (*mocum*), nowadays used as an equivalent of the English "mister" and considered to be honorific. After death *awâsis*, "the animal" is proper.^{146a}

of the Labrador peninsula. Both linguistically and culturally their primary affiliations are with the Algonkians of the northeast and not with those to the west of them.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 71.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 72. *tukwaiâkēn*

¹⁴² While this is a possible rendering for the initial syllable of the term it cannot be taken as final since the word occurs in other animals' names in eastern dialects, e.g., moose, muskrat, and mink.

¹⁴³ Mr. Skinner tells me that once when he was out hunting with some Cree and a bear came within range the animal ran off into the woods before he could shoot. The Indians immediately began to call the bear *muskwa*' and other invectives. When asked why they did this, the natives explained that the bear is just like a person; if you can get him mad, he will come back and want to fight.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 72. *Wakiush*.

¹⁴⁶ Skinner, pp. 71-2. *icishēalk* (old Porcupine); *pisēsu* or *pisistciū* (resembling a cat or lynx). Another term, *wakiū*, Skinner believes to be a variant of *wakiush*, and *matsue*', a variant of *muskwa*. *Matsue*, however, instead, of being a variant of *muskwa* as Skinner assumes, has the appearance of being *matciweo*, "he is bad," and may therefore be another independent synonym for the bear.

^{146a} Cf. Comeau (p. 85) who says the Godbout band of the Montagnais use the same synonym. I am indebted to Mr. D. S. Davidson (University of Pennsylvania) for the above data which he has supplied from unpublished field notes.

Northern Sauteaux.—Of these people Skinner reports that, in addition to the generic term for the bear,¹⁴⁷ they have a synonymy which they refuse to divulge to white people "for fear that ill success will attend them."¹⁴⁸

Plains Cree.—The bear is called "four legged human,"¹⁴⁹ "chief's son,"¹⁵⁰ "crooked,"¹⁵¹ "tired."¹⁵²

Ojibway.—In his well known *Travels*, A. Henry reports the use of the terms "relative" and "grandmother" in an apologetic speech to the bear¹⁵³ which we shall have occasion to refer to later.

Sauk.—Before a bear is killed a conciliatory speech is made in which the animal is called "old man."¹⁵⁴

Menomini.—The term "elder brother" is used when the speech of apology is made¹⁵⁵ and Hoffman reports that in the Grand Med-

¹⁴⁷ *Mukwuh*, (1), p. 164.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid*. This inhibition clearly illustrates the subjective importance of these synonyms.

¹⁴⁹ Skinner (4), p. 541. The native term is not given, although an untranslated synonym, 'neokwataicin,' the meaning for the first part of which is "four legs," (suggested by Dr. Speck) comes very close to it. The generic word is *múskwá*.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid*. *okemaúokusan*.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid*. *wakaiuc*; cf. E. Cree *wakuish* (crooked tail), Skinner (1), p. 72.

¹⁵² *Nestoiuc*. Skinner (4), p. 541.

¹⁵³ p. 143. Cf. Jones, II, p. 279, where an ill-treated lad befriended by a bear calls the latter "grandfather" and reciprocally (p. 273) a bear calls a boy grandchild." A wolf is called "brother," I, pp. 74-5. Henry also reports (p. 175) the use of "grandfather" for the rattlesnake.

¹⁵⁴ I.e. *páshito*. See Skinner (6), p. 21. This is also one of the personal names used by members of the bear gens and there are others of like meaning, e.g., *mák-wámuét*, old Man Bear, *mákwi-páshito*, Bear Old Man. A cognate term also occurs in the sib names of the bear people among the Prairie Potawatomi, i.e., *Mukopashitá*, Skinner (8). Mr. Skinner suggested to the writer that these, as well as other personal names used in the bear sibs among the central Algonkian tribes, practically all of which refer to some habit or characteristic quality of bears, may have originally been a part of a rich synonymy for the bear. Some of personal names of the Menomini bear sib may, for example, be thus used. The circumlocutory customs such as we have described would account, in part, for the development of this linguistic feature, and later it is conceivable that the terminology may have become segregated by the use of these old synonyms for the bear as personal names of the bear sib people. The contents of the medicine bundles of the bear gens, so Mr. Skinner tells me, have practically no connection with the bear in any of the tribes with which he is acquainted.

¹⁵⁵ Jenks, p. 680.

icine Lodge the term used for the bear was *nanoq'ke*. It refers to one of the deities who was changed by the Great Mystery into an Indian.¹⁵⁶

Blackfoot.—Although none of the characteristic practices of bear ceremonialism have been reported from the Blackfoot, we do find references to the fact that certain substitutions for the generic term for bears are in use.¹⁵⁷ One specific occasion when this is necessary, is when there are medicine bundles hanging up in a tipi. Guests seeing these "must act accordingly and designate the bear, if at all, by some descriptive terms." The beast may, for instance, be referred to as the "unmentionable one" or "that big hairy one."¹⁵⁸ In speaking of a particular grizzly, "sticky mouth," is a term often used.¹⁵⁹

Miscellaneous

The Luiseno¹⁶⁰ call the bear "great-grandfather" and the Tsimshian and Tahltan sometimes employ the term "grandfather."¹⁶¹

Among the Thompson River Indians the use of special names for the bear and other animals is in quite a different setting than we found to be the case among the eastern Algonkians and which is characteristic of Eurasian peoples. All animals have names of their own which can only be revealed by the guardian spirit of an individual. Knowledge of this name gives the hunter special power over the animals. "A man who, knowing the name of the grizzly bear, for instance, addresses him, gains so much power over him that the bear at once becomes gentle and harmless." This knowledge of animal names is passed only from father to son.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁶ p. 305. Dr. Speck suggests "my apparition" (that which is visible) as a rendering for this term.

¹⁵⁷ The ordinary term is *kydiu* (personal communication, G. B. Grinnell) for all varieties. Cf. Schultz, p. 106.

¹⁵⁸ Wissler (5), pp. 52, 154. There is a myth which explains the origin of this custom, see p. 164.

¹⁵⁹ Communication, G. B. Grinnell; Schultz (p. 106) gives this as *Pah-ksi-kwo-yi* and remarks that the medicine-pipe men were obliged to use this term. "They, too, were the only ones who could take any of the skin of a bear, and then merely a strip for a head band or pipe wrapping."

¹⁶⁰ Gifford (2), p. 209, *piwi*.

¹⁶¹ Information on the Tahltan from MS notes of J. Teit through the courtesy of D. Jenness.

¹⁶² Teit (4), p. 354.

It would seem that this might be classed as a form of verbal magic and so far as the other tribes of our survey are concerned, this is the only case where a knowledge of the name of the bear is of any coercive value. In other cases, the names for the bear are honorific and lack all traces of any magical aspect.

EURASIA

Siberia.—In the Old World we find a similar taboo upon the use of the bear's name and a substitution of other terms.¹⁶³

Kamchadal

Among the Kamchadal, Steller says that they have all sorts of formulas which they use in speaking of the animals they reverence. They do not call the whale, bear, and wolf by their proper names when they meet them, as these creatures understand human speech.¹⁶⁴ Krashenninikoff reports this custom for the bear and the wolf.¹⁶⁵

Yukaghir

Bogoras reports¹⁶⁶ that the Russianized Yukaghir of the Kolyma, "when speaking of a bear, uses the words "grandfather," "old man," or still shorter, "he." In the address to the slain bear recorded by Jochelson, the terms "grandfather," "owner of the earth," and "great man," are those which appear.¹⁶⁷

Ainu

Among the Ainu there is a varied synonymy. Some of them will say, claiming genetic kinship with the bear, "As for me, I am a child of the god of the mountains; I descended from the divine one who rules in the mountains."¹⁶⁸ A similar euphemism is the "dear

¹⁶³ Labbé (p. 231) calls special attention to this fact in respect to the natives of Siberia, who, he says, do not like to pronounce the name of the bear. Without referring them to specific peoples the author gives the following substitutive terms: "the little old man," "the master of the forest," "the respected one" (le respecté), "the wise one" (le savant). The animal is also called "my cousin" or referred to as "that's him."

¹⁶⁴ p. 176.

¹⁶⁵ Quoted by Czaplicka (5), p. 270, from Russian ed., p. 80.

¹⁶⁶ (1), p. 325.

¹⁶⁷ Jochelson (4), p. 122.

¹⁶⁸ Batchelor (1), p. 485. The Kurile Ainu (Torii, p. 256) call the bear "*Tchiramendep*" or "*Kim-Kamoui*," the god of the mountains.

little divine thing who resides among the mountains."¹⁶⁹ The much discussed term "*kamui*" is also applied to the bear.¹⁷⁰

The Gilyak and other Amur peoples speak of the bear as "*mafa*" or "*mapa*."¹⁷¹

Ural-Altaic Peoples

The Yakut, according to Shklovsky,¹⁷² consider it a "sin" to pronounce the name of the bear and consequently speak of the beast as "grandfather" or "he." Other synonyms are "beloved uncle,"¹⁷³ "lord," "worthy old man," "good father."¹⁷⁴

"The Tungus call the bear 'old man' and 'grandfather,' both terms implying respect."¹⁷⁵

A similar custom is reported for Finno-Ugrian groups. The Ostyak are reported by Castrén to apply the term "Pelzvater," "Nagelgreis," and "das schöne Tier" to the beast,¹⁷⁶ and the Samoyed, "Altvater."¹⁷⁷ The Vogul called the bear "the venerable

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 486.

¹⁷⁰ Consult Batchelor (2) for the Ainu usage of the term "*kamui*," also Chamberlain (2) and Sternberg (4), pp. 426-27. This word is by no means limited to the bear; in fact, Sternberg goes so far as to say that "Beast and *kamui* are synonymous." But, although animals may be called *kamui*, conscious worship is rendered to "the masters" of each species or element, who, in their turn, too, are called "*kamui*, with the appellation of this or that sphere of nature added." "Thus 'bears' as individuals may be called '*kamui*' and also the 'master' of the bears." See also my section on the Ainu bear festival.

¹⁷¹ Ravenstein, p. 379, renders this as "chief" or "elder." The Tiger is called *Sakhale mafa* (black chief).

Lansdell, p. 607, not only gives the same information but the wording of the passage itself is redolent of Ravenstein who wrote twenty years earlier.

Fraser renders the term as "grandfather" or "ancestor" and also refers to the term for tiger which, he says, means "old black grandfather." His specific reference is apparently to the Orotchi.

¹⁷² P. 23. (Kolyma district). This author also claims that the bear is considered an incarnation of one of their gods, "Ulu-Tayon," and is addressed by this term.

¹⁷³ Simpson, I, p. 266.

¹⁷⁴ Galitzin.

¹⁷⁵ Czaplicka (6), p. 138. Mr. H. U. Hall has given me the following from his Limpiisk Tungus vocabulary, *amaka*: grf., old man; *amakasi*: bear. The termination of the latter word is obscure. It may be a possessive pronominal suffix.

¹⁷⁶ Castrén (1), vol. II, p. 59. Sommier (p. 166) also refers to the first two terms as circumlocutions used to avoid offending the bear and says that they remind him of a similar Lappish usage.

¹⁷⁷ Castrén (2), p. 189.

one," avoiding thereby the mention of the animal's proper name.¹⁷⁸ Among the Votyak, similarly, the term *maka*, "the old man," is substituted,¹⁷⁹ or "uncle of the woods."¹⁸⁰ The Kalevala gives ample evidence of a rich synonymy for the bear among the ancient Finns. In Rune 46 the animal is called "honey eater," "honey paws," "forest-apple," "golden friend of fen and forest," "pride of Woodlands," "famous Light-foot," the "Illustrious," "Pride¹⁸¹ and Beauty of the forest," "the Master," "Loved-one from the Glenwood."

The term "broad-foot" is a synonym reported to be in use by the Esthonians.¹⁸² Among the Lapps it is said that there was a taboo upon the use of the proper name for the bear and that they called it "the old man with the fur garment."¹⁸³

We may add the ancient Hungarians, as Kohlback¹⁸⁴ draws attention to the fact that the animal seemed to have inspired them with solemn dread (heilige Scheu) as they did not utter its name and in their later home made use of the Slavic name *medve(d)* for the bear.

¹⁷⁸ Ahlqvist, p. 173. This author says that just as in the ancient forests of Finland the bear was called "honey paws" instead of by its true name "so vermeiden auch die Wogulen die Nennung seines Namens und nennen ihn gewöhnlich den Alten (*anduch*) mit welchem Namen man ohne Zweifel seine Ehrfurcht ausdrücken will."

¹⁷⁹ Georgi, I, p. 138.

¹⁸⁰ Buch, p. 139. *tel*, *nules*, *caca*=forest; *nunä*=uncle. This writer says these people, like the Finns and Lapps, apply flattering names to the bear which are used half playfully, half reverentially. He says *moko* (cf. Georgi's statement) is also customary.

¹⁸¹ Crawford's translation vol. II. Cf. Castren (2), p. 201, who gives, in addition, "the old Man." For other metaphysical synonyms for the bear see Abercromby, II, pp. 56, 157-160, 208-209, 309-311.

¹⁸² Quoted by Frazer (Taboo), p. 398, from Boecler-Kreutzwald, *Der Esthen abergläubische Gebräuche, Weisen und Gewohnheiten*, p. 120. The wolf is called "grey coat."

¹⁸³ Pinkerton (Leems), p. 485, "*moedda-aigja*." The proper name is "*gouzhja*"; Dillon, II, p. 219 (Koutokeino Lapps, Norway); Georgi, I, p. 33. Cf. general statement of Lappish analogies to other Finno-Ugrian peoples in Sommer and Buch, *op. cit.* Johan Turi (p. 123) gives "Pelzgreise" as a synonym for the bear.

¹⁸⁴ p. 332-3, who quotes as his source "Magyar Mythologia," p. 152, by Jacob Kandra, ed. by his friend Dr. Pasztor, 1897.

Indo-European Peoples

Euphemistic names for the bear are to be found among the Swedish peasantry, according to Lloyd.¹⁸⁵ The herd-girls, for example, "entertain the notion that if the world or the bear be called by other than their own proper and legitimate names, they will not attack the cattle." The bear is addressed by terms similar to those prevailing among the Finno-Ugrian people of the North, i.e., the old man, great father, twelve men's strength,¹⁸⁶ golden feet. A similar custom is found among the Slavic Huzules,¹⁸⁷ who consider it necessary to avoid the use of the proper name for the bear and so respectfully call the animal, "the little uncle," or "the big hairy one."¹⁸⁸

The foregoing data, scattered as they are, show that the custom of substituting special terms for the bear is a practice associated with the animal from Laborador to northern Europe.¹⁸⁹

The terms themselves may be grouped as follows:¹⁹⁰

a) Descriptive periphrasis or circumlocutions based on some real or imaginary characteristic trait or aspect of the bear; e.g., "short tail," "black food," "honey eater."

b) Metaphorical expressions; e.g., "old man with the fur garment," "the venerable one," "golden friend of fen and forest."

c) Kinship terms.

¹⁸⁵ p. 251. The terms applied to both the wolf and the bear are called "Smek-namn" or "caressive names." This author says the terms applied to the wolf are "legion, but for the most part untranslatable." He gives as samples, "The silent one," "Grey Legs," "Golden Tooth."

¹⁸⁶ This euphemistic epithet is evidently common to both Swedes and Lapps as Brooke (p. 184) says that there is a common saying among the latter people that the bear had "12 men's strength and 10 men's understanding."

¹⁸⁷ A pastoral people of the Carpathians, collectively known as Ruthenians or Little Russians.

¹⁸⁸ See Kaindl (1), p. 103; (2), p. 387.

¹⁸⁹ Although the widely known synonym *bruin*, in common usage among western European peoples and ourselves, may have originally had some connection with the type of linguistic substitution we have been discussing, our free supplementary use of it, in addition to the generic term, is in contrast with the enforced substitution which marks the psychology of most of the peoples we have reviewed.

¹⁹⁰ See Skeat and Blagden, II, p. 415 *seq.* for the linguistic taboos and circumlocution of the Malays used in fishing, fowling, camphor hunting, etc. whose classification of terms I have followed.

Many of the terms used for the bear are, in native usage, undoubtedly euphemistic or at least honorific, although it would be a difficult matter to classify them from this point of view. The intention seems to be to please the animal (or its spirit controller) by the substitution, or, to put it negatively, to avoid any possible offense. It seems to me that this is clearly the case when this practice is put side by side with the other elements of bear ceremonialism which we shall shortly discuss. This is, however, a psychological generalization which it would be hazardous to insist upon, in view of the many cultures in which the practice appears and considering the absence of detailed information in so many of them.

The occurrence of all three types of expressions in certain tribes and among the peoples of both America and Eurasia does not permit us to base any conclusion on their geographical distribution, but taken collectively, the practice is significant—not that linguistic substitutions of this sort are unique in the regions and cultures studied, or that the practice is associated with the bear alone. Indeed it is quite apparent, although the available data are more meager for other creatures, that many other animals toward which magico-religious attitudes are held, receive designations under certain circumstances which parallel those bestowed upon the bear.¹⁹¹ But, there is this difference to be noted. Whereas the animals to which such terms are applied vary tremendously as we go from tribe to tribe, the bear is the *constant* recipient of circumlocutory terms over the whole area studied. Moreover, we have many positive statements to the effect that this practice is accompanied with a taboo upon the use of the generic term upon occasions when the hunter is in direct contact with the animal, when alive or dead, or both. There is also a hint, where our data are fullest, that quantitatively the synonymy for the bear is richer than that for other animals to whom the same customs may apply, which distinguishes the practice as associated with this beast, from its usage in connection with other

¹⁹¹ All of the comparable material we have been able to collect has been referred to in the footnotes.

animals. These facts suggest what we should expect in view of the other customs and beliefs of which bears are the object, viz., that the custom is more closely and typically associated with the bear than with other animals, although further investigation of specific groups would be necessary to prove this conclusively.

THE CUSTOM OF TALKING TO THE BEAR

CALLING THE BEAR OUT OF ITS DEN

In Labrador, the Montagnais-Naskapi request the animal to come out of its den, and they maintain that it does so. They address it as "grandfather," but if the beast does not appear after being called three times, they know that they have made a mistake in the sex, and so they say "*olewi nokàm*" (Come out, grandmother). If the bear growls the third time they know they have it right.¹⁹²

Among the Penobscot it was formerly the custom, after the den of the animal was located, for the "hunters to gather at the spot and talk to the beast." After a little of this talk, they say, he will invariably come out.¹⁹³ The Malecite also called out the bear.¹⁹⁴ The Abenaki hunter throws a stick into the bear's lair first, and then says, "*Tca sawosà*" (now, indeed, come out), and the beast comes out and is killed.¹⁹⁵ Mr. Davidson tells me that among the Tête de Boule the bear is called "grandfather" by the hunters and requested to allow itself to be killed.

The custom of asking the bear to come out and be killed is also recorded in a few other scattered instances. The Thompson River Indians begged their prey to come out and be shot, and the

¹⁹² B. Picard and Pitabano. Bears not only understand what the hunters say, but know when the latter are coming for them. Dr. F. G. Speck has recorded a tale in which such an episode occurs. There are variant forms of this speech recorded from different bands. At Escoumains they say, "Come out, grandfather, already it (the sun) is warm enough for you to come forth." A further exhortation, "Show me your head, grandfather," is sometimes added.

¹⁹³ MS, F. G. Speck. They say "*awesus nodesa*" (bear, walk out) or *Ki awss* "*us kamaskul nodesa*" (Bear, I've found you, so come out). *Ki* is an exclamative, indicating surprise.

¹⁹⁴ MS, F. G. S. Informant Gabe Paul.

¹⁹⁵ MS, notes, A.I.H.

grizzily, especially, was petitioned not to be angry with the hunter nor fight with him, but to take pity on him, in short, to give himself up.¹⁹⁶ Shasta hunters did likewise,¹⁹⁷ and among the Carrier, bears "were summoned to issue from their holes."¹⁹⁸

For Siberian tribes data on this practice are very unsatisfactory. Bogoras, writing of the Lamut is, however, very specific. After a bear den is surrounded the hunters sing: "Grandfather, Old One, Our Grandmother, and the older sister of yours, Dantra, ordered you saying, Do not frighten us! Die of your own choice."^{198a} One of the early writers on Gilyak customs¹⁹⁹ refers to the practice of shamans reciting "love songs" to the bear in its den, asking the beast to come forth from its hiding place. Von Schrenck, commenting on this, maintains that Gilyak shamans have nothing to do with the hunting of the bear or any other animal. In view, however, of the presence elsewhere of this custom as an integral part of the bear hunt, not as a function of the shaman, but as practiced by the ordinary hunter, the record of Nordmann is very suggestive. Whether the shaman or the hunter did it, does not matter so much, as I see it, but whether it was done at all.

CONCILIATORY SPEECHES

A custom somewhat allied to the foregoing, in so far as both assume that the bear understands what is said to it, is a speech, conciliatory in character, which is made to the beast. In some tribes this address is made prior to killing the animal, while in others it is made after death. Although we shall later discuss the ceremonialism often connected with the bears' carcass, the apologies offered, whether at that time or earlier, are so similar in spirit and content that it will be convenient to give an account

¹⁹⁶ Teit (4), p. 347. Deer (*Ibid.*, p. 346) were also asked "to present themselves to be shot at."

¹⁹⁷ R. R. Dixon (2), p. 432.

¹⁹⁸ Information, Mr. D. Jenness, letter October 17, 1924.

^{198a} "If the bear is 'well-minded,' he will obey the prayer and present of his own will the side to the spear. He will die of the first blow and consequently his death will be easy and even pleasant, 'similar to tickling.' An 'evil minded' bear may stand on his own defence and even kill a hunter or so; and therefore his death will be painful and bad." Bogoras, (3) p. 208.

¹⁹⁹ Nordmann, cited by Von Schrenck, III, p. 561.

of their characteristics and trace out their geographical distribution at this point rather than separate them according to whether they are made before or after killing the bear.

ADDRESS OF APOLOGY

In North America an address of pardon or apology to the bear is reported for the following peoples: Montagnais-Naskapi,²⁰⁰ Malecite,²⁰¹ St. Francis Abenaki,²⁰² Eastern Cree,²⁰³ Northern Saulteaux, Tête de Boule,²⁰⁴ Plains Ojibway,²⁰⁵ Ottawa,²⁰⁶ Menomini,²⁰⁷ Sauk,²⁰⁸ Fox,²⁰⁹ Ojibway.²¹⁰ The Tlingit and possibly the Winnebago may also be mentioned in this connection.²¹¹

²⁰⁰ Although Dr. Speck has been unable, as yet, to secure a positive statement from the aborigines of the Labrador peninsula as to this custom, it seems worth while to record the statement of Mr. Frank Gallenne of Seven Islands, P. Q., who has been a resident there for forty years and speaks one of the Naskapi dialects. He told me that he had been with the Indians when they hunted bear and that on more than one occasion they asked the animal's pardon before killing it. He cited it as one of the most curious of their superstitions. Comeau (p. 85) writes that "when caught in a steel trap or seen at a distance, he (the bear) is spoken to and asked that vengeance be not taken for his death."

²⁰¹ Mechling, p. 101 (note). The hunter "tells a bear before he kills it that he is sorry that he is in need of food and has to kill it."

²⁰² Ms. text, A. I. H. "I killed you because I need your skin for my coat, and your flesh so that I can eat, because I have nothing to live on."

²⁰³ Skinner (1), p. 69. The bear hunter explains that nothing but hunger drove him to kill it and "begs the animal not to be offended," nor "permit the spirits of other bears to be angry."

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

²⁰⁵ Skinner (4). The hunter approaches the lair and says, "I am thankful that I found you and sorry that I am obliged to kill you," promising the spirit of the beast a sacrifice of maple sugar or berries.

²⁰⁶ Jes. Rel., Vol. 67 (1716-27), p. 157. Cf. Handbook, II, p. 169. "When they kill a bear they make feast of its own flesh, they talk to it, they harangue it, they say, 'Do not leave an evil thought against us because we have killed thee. Thou hast intelligence, thou seest that our children are suffering from hunger. They love thee and wish thee to enter into their bodies. Is it not a glorious thing for thee to be eaten by the children of captains?'"

²⁰⁷ Jenks, p. 680. The animal is told that the "killing was accidental or else that he must forgive him this one offense for his poor family is starving." Hoffman writes, "Although a Bear (sib) man may kill a bear, he must first address himself to it and apologize for depriving it of life. . . ." (p. 44). "Should an Indian of the Bear totem, or one whose adopted guardian is represented by the bear, desire to go hunting and meet with that animal, due apology would be paid to it before destroying it."

In Asia we may refer to the Kamchadal,²¹² Yukaghir,²¹³ Ostyak (Ugrian).²¹⁴ Among the Ainu, a speech of this type is an important feature of the bear festival.²¹⁵ Whether a bear's pardon is asked when killed in the woods, is a point we have not been able to clear up from the available literature. Batchelor does not refer to it although he describes how the animals are hunted.²¹⁶ Mrs. Bird's statement that "when a bear is trapped or wounded by an arrow, the hunters go through an apologetic or propitiatory

(p. 65). This is the only case in which we have found any association between the conciliatory address and members of a specific social group.

²⁰⁸ Skinner (6), p. 21 and verbal information.

²⁰⁹ Owen, p. 55, "When a bear was engaged, the hunters broke silence by telling t how they respected it and hoped that it would allow itself to be killed."

²¹⁰ Henry (p. 143) was present when a bear was killed. Members of the party, but more particularly one of the old women, took the dead animal's head in their hands, stroking and kissing it several times; begging a thousand pardons for taking away her (the bear's) life; calling her their relation and grandmother, and requesting her not to lay the fault upon them, since it was truly an Englishman that had put her to death."

²¹¹ Swanton (2), p. 455 and Radin p. 111. The bear is greatly venerated among the Winnebago.

²¹² Steller, p. 280, is categorical about this. He says the Kamchadal never killed a land or sea animal without first making excuses to it and begging the beast not to take offense. Even if a native meets a bear "spricht er nur *sipang*, und beredet ihn von weitem Freundschaft zu halten" (p. 114). Dr. Jochelson tells me that the Kamchadal make a speech similar to that of the Yukaghir.

²¹³ Jochelson (4), p. 122. Taking off the skin of a slain bear they say, "Grandfather, owner of the earth, don't think ill of us. We did not do this to you. The Yakut did it. Your "silver" bones we shall put in a special house." (This means that a grave-house similar to that constructed for human beings will be made. The implication is that the beast will be treated like a deceased relative or friend.) I am indebted to Dr. Jochelson for the English translation of the above from the original Yukaghir text which, in his published work, appears only in a Russian rendering.

²¹⁴ Georgi, p. 200. "Whenever they kill one of these animals they sing songs over him, in which they ask his pardon and hang up his skin, to which they show many civilities, and pay many fine compliments, to induce him not to take vengeance on them in the abode of spirits." Pallas, III, p. 64 (trans. by Trusler, p. 317). After killing a bear it is skinned and the latter is hung on a tree. "All sorts of reverence is paid to it, and the best apologies made to the animal for its being killed. By doing this, they hope to avert, in a polite way, the injury which might otherwise be done them by the spirit of the animal." Sommier, p. 217. See Czaplicka (2) for the subdivisions of the Ostyak.

²¹⁵ Batchelor (1), p. 417; Labbé, pp. 241-243, 251; Czaplicka (5), p. 297.

²¹⁶ Batchelor (1), pp. 473-477.

ceremony'²¹⁷ is suggestive, without being in any way conclusive. All we can say is that observers of the Ainu have been so much impressed with the bear festival and so few have evidently traveled with the natives into the bush, that descriptions of the periodic communal ceremonies have entirely eclipsed the less picturesque customs which undoubtedly take place whenever a bear is killed.

DEATH ATTRIBUTED TO A SPECIOUS AGENCY

In addition to the apologetic note which characterizes so many of the conciliatory speeches made to bears, either before or after killing them, there are several variant features worthy of notice. These may accompany a specific apology or be the principal point of emphasis in some tribes. One of the most interesting and important of these is the custom of telling the beast that its slayers are not its slayers. That is, the responsibility is frequently shifted to a fictitious agency. In North America the clearest case of this sort I have found recorded is in Henry's account of the Ojibway, in which the animal is assured that an Englishman put it to death and not an Indian.²¹⁸ In Asia, it is very common in Siberia, and is reported for tribes for which the more generalized type of speech has already been indicated. Czaplicka²¹⁹ gives this as typical: "It was not I, Grandfather; it was the Russians (i.e., any European) who have killed you through me. I am grieved, I am truly grieved. Be not angry with me." The Koryak,²²⁰ Kamchadal,²²¹ and Yukaghir²²² say it, the latter placing

²¹⁷ Bird, II, p. 101.

²¹⁸ Op. cit., p. 143. Cf. however, the Menomini (Jenks, p. 680) among whom the bear is sometimes told that the killing was accidental. And also the Kwakiutl (passim) who say "I did not do any harm to you." A similar notion is implicit in the Montagnais-Naskapi practice of using a circumlocutory term in speaking of the bear after death; such as "I have killed the 'black food'." The Indians say that this is done so that the animal will not know who killed it. So far as I can see, the Asiatic peoples evidence a more formalized expression of the same basic idea.

²¹⁹ (6), p. 138. It is not exclusively connected with the bear. See, e.g., the generalized account given by Bogoras (3), pp. 210-211 of the "Thanksgiving Ceremonial of heads" celebrated by the Chukchi, Koryak, Asiatic Eskimo, and Kamchadal. The animals are told that stones killed them.

²²⁰ Bastian, III, p. 26.

²²¹ Steller, p. 331. After feasting on bear's flesh the host would lay the blame

the blame upon the Yakut or the elk, the others upon the Russians.²²³ Among the Gilyak the toad, at least for the purposes of the bear festival, is deemed the scapegoat.²²⁴ Proceeding westward we may mention the Yakut,²²⁵ Tungus,²²⁶ Ostyak (Ugrian),²²⁷ and the Votyak,²²⁸ as practitioners of this cajolery. The Kalevala also contains a reference to this custom.²²⁹

OTHER FEATURES

In a number of American tribes, specific reasons are given the bear as to why its life must be taken. These are simply the obvious utilitarian ones. The hunter needs the creature's flesh for food and its skin for clothing.²³⁰

of the animal's death on the Russians and request the beast to take vengeance upon them.

²²² Jochelson, *op. cit.*, (4), p. 122. Another version was this:

Q. Oh! great man, who did it to you (i.e., killed you)?

A. The being who is feeding on small trees (referring to an elk).

I am indebted to Dr. Jochelson for this translation.

²²³ It is said that the Chuckchi tell a wolf that the Russians killed it (Pauly p. 7), begging the beast not to be angry.

²²⁴ Von Schrenck, III, p. 715.

²²⁵ Galitzin. While eating the bear the guests "apostrophize the ghost." "No," say they, "don't believe us capable of having perpetrated such a murder. Among us, poor Yacoutes, the art of making guns and deadly balls is unknown. They are either some Russian's or Tungouse's who have done the evil deed." As it is customary with them to preserve the bones, they go on to say, "Far from being murderers, it is, on the contrary, we who gather together here the bones of this bear killed by others."

²²⁶ Czaplicka (1), p. 476. Unfortunately, the author does not specify any particular group but presumably she is generalizing regarding the northern branch which she personally knew best.

²²⁷ Ides, p. 21. They address the dead carcass thus: "Who killed you? the Russians they answer themselves. Who cut off your Head? a Russian ax. Who cut up your Belly? a Knife which a Russian made. And more such Follies are they guilty of. In a word the Russians bear all the blame, and they are entirely innocent of murder of the bear." Czaplicka (2), p. 575; Sommer, p. 217; Ahlqvist, p. 298; Gondatti, p. 79.

²²⁸ Buch, p. 139. These people suggest that the animal has fallen from a tree or met his death in some other way.

²²⁹ Rune 46, Crawford's translation, II, p. 664. Ahlqvist also cites this parallel, pp. 297-8; viz., that the bear met its death by slipping from a tree or impaling itself on a sharp branch.

²³⁰ St. Francis Abenaki, Malecite, Eastern Cree, Ottawa, Menomimi. The Tlingit (Swanton [2], p. 455) talk to the head of the slain bear, "as if to a human being," when they have brought it into camp and decorated it. They say, "I am your friend. I am poor and come to you." Before burning the entrails the hunter said to

The use of kinship terms, or other circumlocutory expressions in place of the name of the bear, probably appears with more frequency in these speeches than our actual data show. Few authors have given us verbatim addresses to the bear, and even those who cite the custom of linguistic substitution do not always give the terms used upon specific occasions.

In some instances the bear is petitioned not to allow the spirits of other bears to be angry with the hunter²³¹ or asked to inform other members of its species how well it was treated, so that they will desire to share a similar fate.²³² In some American tribes of the Plateau Area, the North Pacific Coast and Mackenzie area, we find that a "mourning-song" is chanted after the animal's death. Its function seems to be analogous to the conciliatory speeches of other peoples. The strong propitiatory element in these songs is apparent in the "bear-song" of the Lillooet,²³³ which we quote:

them, "I am poor. That is why I am hunting you." This speech was to conciliate the bear's friends who might kill the hunter if he did not use good words toward one of their species.

²³¹ E. Cree (Skinner [1], p. 69). The same belief is entertained by the Eskimo of the west coast of Hudson Bay (Boas [2], p. 501) and may be implicit in the case of other peoples who do not actually express it in an address to the bear.

²³² Thompson (Teit [4] p. 347. Cf. Krakinh. The Thaltai' say to a slain male bear "Grandfather, may your wives and children follow you." MS. note J. Teit.

Kamchadal (Steller, p. 331). The treatment here referred to, is the food placed before the carcass, etc., which we will discuss in a later section. The belief was that by so doing other members of the species would be prevented from avoiding man. (*Ibid.*, p. 280). The author also says (p. 331) that seals, sea lions, and other animals were also treated with a similar ceremonious respect, although no details are given. For similar elements in Ainu speeches to bears, see Batchelor p. 487 and Labbé (Saghalin Ainu), pp. 242-3.

Cf. Featherman p. 422 (Quoted by Frazer p. 224) for Votyak.

²³³ Teit (1), p. p. 279. "When an earnest and good singer chanted this song, using effective words, and speaking, as it were, from his heart, his listeners were so moved that they wept, and the tears rolled down their cheeks." Teit says the air is somewhat different from the bear songs of the Thompson River Indians. He states, (4) p. 347, that this latter group consider the spirit of the bear to be very powerful and mysterious and before singing the bear song the hunters paint their faces with alternate perpendicular stripes of black and red. Similarly, the Shuswap (Teit (2), p. 602) "sang the grisley or black bear song as the case might be, and prayed, 'Oh, thou greatest of all animals, thou man of animals, now my friend, thou art dead. May thy mystery make all other animals like women when I hunt them. May they follow

You died first, greatest of animals.
 We respect you, and will treat you accordingly.
 No woman shall eat your flesh;
 No dogs shall insult you.
 May the lesser animals all follow you.
 And die by our traps, snares and arrows!
 May we now kill much game,
 And may the goods of those we gamble with follow us,
 And come into our possession!
 May the goods of those we play *lehal* with become completely
 ours,
 Even as an animal slain by us.

The Thompson people also thanked the bear for allowing itself to be killed,²³⁴ a feature to be found also among the Lapps,²³⁵ who thanked the animal for not hurting them and for not breaking their weapons. Another writer says that it is a frequent custom among the latter people "to speak to the beast when about to attack it" for they suppose "that it perfectly comprehends their discourse."²³⁶

Despite the wide variation in the content of speeches, songs, or addresses to the bear I should like to emphasize the fact that among the tribes inhabiting the northern forests of both continents, the custom of talking to the bear either before or after killing it, or both, is a constant feature in all the groups where any

thee and fall an easy prey to me.' " A bear mourning song is mentioned for the Tsimshian (Boas (7), p. 283). The Western Carriers sang a song at the killing of a black bear (perhaps also the grizzly). This is done "so that as the bear dies it may say, 'I like that song,' and the hunter will be able to shoot many bears thereafter." (Information, Mr. Jenness.) The Tahltan sing mourning songs over the bear which they have learned from the Nass River Indians. (D. J. from notes of James Teit.)

Cf. De Smet (1), p. 139, for Assiniboin.

²³⁴ Teit (4), p. 347. They also asked "that the mate of the slain might share a similar fate." Kwakiutl.

²³⁵ Scheffer, p. 233.

²³⁶ Brooke, p. 184. They have a common saying that "the bear has 12 men's strength, and 10 men's understanding." As an illustration of speaking to a bear the author gives the following episode which came to his personal attention: A Lapp, who was once out hunting reindeer, suddenly encountered a bear. His gun missing fire, he said to the beast, "You rascal, you ought to be ashamed of attacking a single man; stop an instant till I have reloaded my rifle and I shall be again ready to meet you." Our author informs us that the animal, which was a female and had two cubs with her, did not heed the hunter but made an immediate retreat.

details are available regarding hunting practices. This is a distinguishing feature of bear hunting as compared with the methods used in the pursuit of other animals.²³⁷ The most widespread convention seems to be that of a conciliatory address to the bear, a specialized feature of which, in Eurasia, is the custom of assigning the blame for the beast's death to some specious agency. In certain contiguous localities we find typical patterns, e.g., the "bear song" among the Western Indians and the custom of calling the bear out of its den among the Wabanaki Algonkians; but even in these cases there are analogous customs to be found elsewhere which, if our information were fuller, might enable us to draw more positive conclusions than our present data warrant.

POST MORTEM CEREMONIES AND CUSTOMS

After killing a bear, it was the custom of many peoples of North America and Eurasia to perform certain rites in connection with the carcass of the animal, or its head and skin and, when feasting upon the flesh of the beast, also to follow definite prescriptions or observe certain taboos. It is our intention to survey this set of customs, distinguishing the peoples who practice such ceremonies from those who do not and endeavoring to emphasize the characteristic form which these observances take. We shall follow a regional grouping of the data,²³⁸ based mainly upon characteristic similarities in the customs themselves. This plan will serve to bring out clearly the major differences which distinguish the practices of one area from those of another. At the same time, however, we shall try to indicate the variations which occur in the observances of the tribes which we have grouped together.

Although our major emphasis will be upon the objective practices themselves, whenever possible, we shall endeavor to throw light upon the motivation of the customs described. In some cases this will be somewhat precarious, however, in view

²³⁷ The exceptions, e.g., among the Kamchadal, are surprisingly few and considering the fact that even relatively superficial observers record these customs for the bear and not for other animals inclines us to think that the lack of data implied a genuine absence of such customs and not an incomplete record.

²³⁸ With one exception, the California-Great Basin area, we have followed the terminology of Wissler (1).

of the meager data available, and in others it cannot even be attempted. Finally, we shall discuss the possible significance of the broad intercontinental analogies which these customs exhibit.

NORTH AMERICA

Eastern Woodlands

Montagnais-Naskapi.—The earliest reference to any special procedure connected with slain bears among the Labrador Indians is that of James Mackenzie.²³⁹ He says, "Of all animals, the bear is regarded with the greatest reverence and respect among the Nascapees. The skin of the first cub they kill in the hunting season being stripped entirely from the carcass, is stuffed with hay,²⁴⁰ and the head and paws decorated with beads, quills and vermillion." The blood, entrails, and flesh are then cooked and everyone participates in the meal, while, "in the center of the feast the skinny deity²⁴¹ is placed, grinning while the drums beat, and the guests devour the flesh in silence."²⁴²

Contemporary investigation of the bear customs of the Labrador aborigines reveals a few simple rites which are still practiced, and there may be still others not yet recorded. In conscious purpose they are directed toward the propitiation of the spiritual controller or "soul spirit" of the bear in order that a ready supply of similar game may be available in the future. While all animals are thought to be under the control of supernatural agents, more or less similar in their *modus operandi*, the

²³⁹ Masson, II, pp. 415-6.

²⁴⁰ This is the only reference among an Algonkian people which refers to the immediate skinning of the bear, or to stuffing it; also to the selection of the first bear killed for ceremonial treatment.

²⁴¹ The religious philosophy of these people is sufficiently well known today to deny any such position of the bear in native thought. Mackenzie was no more obtuse than other early explorers, traders, and travelers, to the fine distinctions which nowadays we find it necessary to make in describing the religious notions of "savages."

²⁴² It is said (*Ibid.*) that the feast is in honor of *Kawabapishit* "to whose paternal bounty they attribute the luxurious meal," but no satisfactory analysis has yet been offered of this word nor does it mean anything to the natives of Labrador today. A possible rendering might be "the little one who is white." (F. G. S.) Cf. Comeau, p. 88, who remarks upon the small amount of conversation carried on at the feast he attended.

bear is uniquely the recipient of special attention, because of the greater power attributed to its "soul spirit."²⁴³ One of the most characteristic observances involves the use of the *nimában* in connection with bear hunting and sometimes other game.²⁴⁴ "When the hunter finds and kills the bear, he sits down near it and smokes. After having laid the bear out on its back with crossed paws, he puts black tobacco in its mouth,²⁴⁵ and places the *nimában* on its breast or about the neck. Sometimes before this is done, the hunter places the *nimában* across his head, allowing the ends to fall over his shoulders. He then dances around the fallen game, at the same time singing, thus expressing the hope that he will have to utilize a pack strap often in bringing back game, and voicing his joy at the success of his hunt."²⁴⁶ If the hunter is unable to carry his quarry to camp alone he will leave the *nimában* on the animal's chest "doubled with its head toward the bear's head." It is believed that "no beast of prey will eat the carcass while the *nimában* is resting on its chest. Possibly the man-smell on the *nimában* may be a safeguard."²⁴⁷

²⁴³ Dr. F. G. Speck, "The Spiritual Beliefs of the Labrador Indians." International Congress of Americanists, The Hague, 1924.

²⁴⁴ See Speck and Heye for full description of these hunting charms. The term *Nimabam* "seems to signify 'dance-cord,' from *nimi*, 'dance,' and the common Algonkian stem—*aban*, denoting 'string,' 'length of something pliable,' which occurs in cognate forms throughout eastern dialects." (p. 8). The one used for a bear hunt (pl. 1) is made of tanned moose skin, decorated, and resembles a pack strap in form. The hunter who has a revelation about game carries it on his person and when he secures the animal dreamed of, he wraps it in the strap and brings it to camp. The decoration on the *nimában* is symbolic in character.

²⁴⁵ The offering of tobacco is of the utmost importance, as will be inferred from the following anecdote told by Jos. Kurtness (Lake St. John). A number of years ago some hunters killed a bear in the spring. They had run out of tobacco, however, and so the son of one of them set out for Metabetchouan Post in order to get some, so as to properly satisfy the spirit of the bear before eating it. The Post was more than a day's journey distant and by the time the boy returned the meat of the beast had begun to putrify. The hunters preferred to lose their game than to depart from the customary treatment of the bear's carcass, a sensible enough procedure from their point of view, as offending the spirit of the bear might make it impossible for them to kill other animals of the species in the future. As will be noted, tobacco was an offering very generally used by the Algonkian tribes in connection with their bear ceremonies, Swanton (Handbook, II, 403), writing upon the subject "Sacrifice," says that tobacco was "the article by far the most widely used" by the North American aborigines.

²⁴⁶ Speck and Heye, *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

In cases where there are several hunters together and a bear is killed, it is customary for them all to sit down around the carcass after the beast has been slain. The oldest man in the group then makes a bark pipe, smokes a while and blows a few puffs into the air before they proceed to eat the bear. The improvised pipe is then thrown away.²⁴⁸ A variant of this custom was related to Dr. Speck and myself by a member of the Ungava band.²⁴⁹ In this region the bark pipe is put into the bear's mouth, the hunter who killed him saying, "My grandfather, I will light your pipe."²⁵⁰ A unique practice of the Davis Inlet people is to lay the gun with which a bear has been killed over the right arm beside the head of the beast for a few minutes.²⁵¹

So far as verbal inquiry goes²⁵² the eating of a bear's flesh among the Montagnais-Naskapi bands is also an occasion when certain characteristic observances are enforced in order that the spiritual controller of the bear may be satisfied. Some of the most distinctive of these seem to apply to the behavior of women and take the form of specific taboos. That these are an ancient part of the Labrador bear complex cannot be doubted in view of the very brief but interesting account given by Le Jeune in the *Relation of 1634*.²⁵³

It was early evening when the bear was brought to camp and immediately all the young girls and married women without children left their respective dwellings and retired to a shelter of their own making some distance away.²⁵⁴ The dogs were also

²⁴⁸ Baptiste Picard, *Seven Islands*, P. Q. Among the Mistassini no bark pipe is used; each hunter smokes his own stone pipe.

²⁴⁹ Pitabeno, who was visiting at *Seven Islands*, July, 1924.

²⁵⁰ *namocum nekacackawuc tsucpwagan*.

²⁵¹ Letter, Dr. T. Michelson, March 13, 1924.

²⁵² A bear feast has not yet been witnessed in any Labrador band by contemporary investigators. The details later given are from the field notes and texts of Dr. F. G. Speck.

²⁵³ *Jes. Rel.* 6, p. 217 seq. Le Jeune was an eye witness of the customs he describes.

²⁵⁴ One can imagine the distress of the good father at this unchivalrous treatment of the fair sex. He writes that they cannot follow this custom without much suffering as bark is not always available with which to make a new shelter, "which in such cases they cover with branches of the fir tree." On the occasion he refers to "it snowed and the weather was very severe." Cf. Micmac and Finns (Kalevala).

ejected from the wigwam where the feast was to take place.²⁵⁵ The bear meat was then cooked in two kettles simultaneously, but the contents of each was eaten separately. The men and older women who had remained in camp sat down at the first repast, after finishing which the women left the dwelling. The men then ate the remainder of the animal. This latter meal, evidently more ceremonial in character, was characterized by the "eat all" feature,²⁵⁶ a custom which is found associated with the eating of bear's flesh among other peoples as well,²⁵⁷ although it is by no means exclusively connected with the bear, even among the Algonkian tribes.²⁵⁸ It indicates, however, the seriousness of the whole affair, in that its purpose, like the other customs already discussed, is magico-religious in character, being directed toward the successful capture of game in the future.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁵ Le Jeune says that this was necessary "lest they lick the blood, or eat the bones, or even the offal of this beast, so greatly is it prized." Cf. Comeau, p. 85, who writes, "at certain times bear feasts used to be held, at which no women were allowed to be present and special wigwams were built wherein to hold the feast." Nothing but bear meat, "roasted on the spit, boiled, or stewed" was eaten on such occasions, or puddings prepared from various parts of the animal.

²⁵⁶ Each person is required to eat the portion of meat given him or, if this is impossible, someone else may usually eat it for him, but at the end of the feast not a morsel must be left. Le Jeune, *op. cit.*, p. 283, writes "They will give to one man what I would not undertake to eat with three good dinners. They would rather burst, so to speak, than to leave anything." Cf. Jes. Rel. v, p. 131.

²⁵⁷ Cf. Tête de Boule, Eastern Cree, Asiatic Eskimo, Lamut, Ainu.

²⁵⁸ Le Jeune (Jes. Rel. ,6, p. 279) gives a dual classification of Montagnais feasts," i.e., the "eat all" or "leave nothing" type and the more ordinary affairs. The former is an affair for the hunters, and women are usually excluded, although he says he has seen "cat all" feasts where both sexes were present. On p. 285 the author writes, "not a word is said; they only sing and sometimes the shaman drums (note Mackenzie's description previously cited). Special care is taken in such feasts to keep the dogs from participating. See pp. 213, 283. This taboo is also mentioned by Le Clerq, p. 291, who refers to similar affairs among the Micmac. For further data see Blair, I, p. 50 and note p. 59 by Tailhan (Central Algonkian); Franklin, p. 71 (Cree) and Harmon, p. 314; Jes. Rel. ,Vol. 50, p. 285 (Ottawa).

²⁵⁹ Le Jeune, p. 293, gives an astute characterization of it when he says, "it is a banquet of devotion." On p. 283 he writes very explicitly, "they make these feasts in order to have a successful chase" and "the more they eat the more efficacious is this feast." Cf. Le Clerq, p. 129. The difficulties of the "robes noires" in doing their share when attending such feasts is amusingly described" in Jes. Rel., 7, p. 99, and 9, p. 199. Comeau also remarks the serious nature of the feast and without explicitly referring to the "eat all" feature calls attention nevertheless to the commendation which accrues to those who eat the most. (pp. 86-88).

Contemporary investigation among the Labrador bands reveals various customs, some of which seem to be allied to those already described. Among the Mistassini,²⁶⁰ for instance, it is necessary for the unmarried women to cover up their faces when a bear's carcass is brought into camp so as not to offend the beast. An infraction of this rule leads to illness. The tent into which the animal is brought must be very clean and the carcass is always covered with a sheet until the feast commences. Only married women may assist the men in skinning the animal. The hide is slit from the throat downward, a procedure motivated by a high regard for the bear, for in the case of other animals the reverse is done.²⁶¹ There are also a number of customary regulations governing the cooking and eating of the bear.²⁶² Among the latter, one of the most widespread and ceremonially important practices is described by Comeau, one of the few white men who have ever attended a Montagnais bear feast. After a large bowl of hot bear's grease had been passed around, the animal's head and neck, which had been roasted on a spit, was stuck up in front of the chief of the band. The latter then made a flattering speech to it.^{262a} Then "the end of the spit was raised and a piece bitten out or torn with the fingers, as no knife must touch this sacred *pièce de résistance*. Like the bowl of fat, it went around, and each one had to take a small piece or a bite as he fancied, but no one was allowed to take

²⁶⁰ The information regarding this band is based on a descriptive text recorded by Dr. F. G. Speck.

²⁶¹ The same practice is followed by the Lake St. John Montagnais the Tête de Boule (in form, J. M. Cooper), and also by the Penobscot. The same reason is given. Cf. the Gilyak procedure.

²⁶² The right upper limb must be kept intact. It is, therefore, roasted separately on a stick, whereas if it were boiled with the rest of the meat the elbow joint might become softened and the bones come apart. It is eaten by the oldest man in camp. It is also the prerogative of the oldest males to eat the heart and pick the bones. All of the meat must be eaten indoors. The coast Montagnais of Les Escoumains have some different regulations. The head of the bear is put on a birch bark dish and the men eat it with their fingers. Women are forbidden any portion of the head. (MS F.G. Speck).

^{262a} "He boasted of the bear's strength and abilities as a tree climber and of its powers of endurance as a faster—referring to its hibernations—and paid it all the other compliments he could think of." Comeau, p. 87.

more.^{262b} What was left was then put into the fire and burned for the absent ones,—the deceased hunters.”^{262c} Everyone was then at liberty to help himself to the rest of the meat or puddings and when all were satisfied the chief dipped his hands into the bowl of fat which served as the first course of the repast and smeared his hair with it. Each guest did the same and the feast was then over. Comeau also mentions taboos connected with the eating of a bear which emphasize the sexual dichotomy which characterizes the bear complex of these people as well as those elsewhere. The head of the beast is particularly forbidden to women,^{262d} a taboo which prevails at Les Escoumains and Michikamau. In some bands a drum dance around the skin is held after the feast²⁶³ and the slayer sings a song.²⁶⁴ In all cases the eating of a bear is an event of great communal importance, a noteworthy fact since the economic life of these northern hunters severely limits the size and frequency of social gatherings.

Wabanaki Tribes.—For the Algonkian peoples south of the St. Lawrence River we have no connected account of ceremonial rites connected with slain bears or any record of special customs or taboos to be observed in eating the flesh. There are, however, a few scattered observations which may be cited.²⁶⁵

Among the Penobscot, the bear was roasted whole and the feast participated in by the whole camp or village. “A herald was appointed by the slayer to go through the camp calling *Kewaladèwal!* (Your dishes), meaning for everybody to come

^{262b} Dr. Speck tells me that the coast Montagnais of Les Escoumains put the head of the bear in a birch bark dish and the men eat it with their fingers. A similar custom prevails in the Michikaman band and Skinner refers to it among the Cree.

^{262c} Comeau, pp. 87-88.

^{262d} p. 85. Children also fall into this category and the paws of the bear are taboo to the same group. Offenders suffer from chronic cold feet.

²⁶³ At Northwest River a bear feast is called *mákásán* and is held whenever a bear is killed. The bones are pounded up and the grease of the bear is served.” There is singing, drumming, and dancing. (Information, Dr. T. Michelson).

²⁶⁴ Baptiste Picard (Seven Islands), Pitabeno (Ungava).

²⁶⁵ The “Bear ceremony” of the Delaware described by Harrington (pp. 171-176) does not correspond in any feature with the type of observance which is under discussion in our study.

and bring his eating utensils."²⁶⁶ The Malecite believed that this feast "satisfied" the spirit of the animal.²⁶⁷

A very interesting custom of the ancient Micmac is recorded by Le Clerq.²⁶⁸ The carcass of a bear was always carried into a wigwam by a special entrance made to the right or left of the regular one. This was explained by saying that women did not deserve to pass through the same place by which a bear had entrance to the dwelling. Childless women and girls had to leave the wigwam while the animal was being eaten.²⁶⁹ Undoubtedly, there were at one time other customs connected with the bear in this area, paralleling, perhaps, those of other Algonkian tribes, but which passed into decadence before any record of them was made.

Northern Algonkian.—If an Eastmain²⁷⁰ hunter is alone when he kills a bear, he cuts off the middle toe and claw of the right forefoot. Upon returning to camp he gives this token to the person who is to carry the body from the woods, usually his wife, if the hunter is married. This individual takes a companion and fetches the carcass.²⁷¹ The claw is "wrapped in cloth, beaded or painted, or both, and kept as a memento of the occasion."²⁷² The beast is laid out, like a man, in front of its slayer's wigwam. Tobacco is placed in the bear's teeth or in its mouth and the "hunter and chief men present smoke over it." At this time the

²⁶⁶ MS, F. G. Speck.

²⁶⁷ Information from Gabe Paul.

²⁶⁸ P. 227. This custom may be connected with the statement of Hagar *htta* in former times each Micmac wigwam possessed a door for each sex and a similar situation among the Penobscot (Inf., F.G.S.) where a young man in training for the hunt used a separate entrance. The special entrance for the bear may, in the former case, have coincided with the entrance for the hunters and their game. Cf. Lapps, Gilyak, Aïnu.

²⁶⁹ It is possible that this is not an independent observation. Le Clerq knew Le Jeune's Relation and may have incorporated certain items of it in his own work.

²⁷⁰ Skinner (1), p. 69.

²⁷¹ The custom of having a woman or some other individual than the hunter bring the game into camp was evidently characteristic of a large number of Algonkian tribes. See Denys, pp. 404, 442, Le Clerq, p. 118 (Micmac); Le Jeune (Jes. Rel., 6), p. 217 (Montagnais); Kohl, p. 412 (Ojibway). There is no mention in these sources, however, of the token which Skinner describes for the Cree.

²⁷² See fig. 36, Skinner, *c.p. cit.*

term "black food" must be used and no one must point his finger at the carcass. The latter taboo also applies to bears in the woods. If broken, the animal will turn and run off, "even if he did not see the offender, for his medicine would warn him of the approach of danger."²⁷³

After the bear is butchered, certain parts, including a piece of the heart, are burnt ("given to its spirit to eat"). The slayer eats the rest of the heart in order to imbibe the "cunning and courage of his victim."^{273a} Women are forbidden to eat of the animal's head or paws, men its rump.

Variations of this procedure are reported for other Cree bands, some of them being slightly more elaborate. At Moose Fort, for example, the eating of the bear is conducted in a more formal manner.²⁷⁴ After the head of the beast was cut off and cooked the males "of the camp sat down in a circle about it. A large stone pipe was laid beside the head and a plug of tobacco placed upon it." The slayer then filled the pipe, lighted it, and each person present, smoked it a little in turn, the slayer initiating the procedure. The bear's head was then passed about and every one strove to bite out a piece of its flesh without touching it with his hands."²⁷⁵ The "eat all" feature seems to be observed in connection with eating a bear at both Eastmain and Rupert's House.²⁷⁶

At Sandy Lake an explanation of these customs was given which, in its fundamental ideology, is undoubtedly of wider provenience among Algonkian hunters of the northern regions. It was said that the bears have a chief whose orders they must obey. He it is who directs a bear to go to a hunter's trap. "When a dead bear is dressed up, it is done as an offering or prayer to the

²⁷³ Members of the Rupert's House band entertain a similar notion, *Ibid* p. 71.

^{273a} Some of the hunters of the Timagami Band eat the heart of every bear killed. Speck (1), p. 26.

²⁷⁴ Skinner *Ibid.*, p. 71.

²⁷⁵ This was also the procedure described by informants from Escoumains and Mickikamau (ms. F. G. Speck). Skinner draws attention to a parallel he observed in the Little Waters Medicine Society of the Seneca. A chunk of pork was substituted for the bear's head. This investigator also observes that in this Cree band a similar ceremony was sometimes performed after killing a caribou.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

chief of the bears to send more of his children to the Indians. If this were not done, the spirit of the bear would be offended and would report the circumstances to the chief of the bears who would prevent the careless Indians from catching more."²⁷⁷ Among the Tête de Boule,^{277a} North Sauteaux,²⁷⁸ Timiskaming Algonquin,²⁷⁹ Ojibway,²⁸⁰ Plains Cree,²⁸¹ and Plains Ojibway,²⁸² although the

²⁷⁷ Skinner (1), p. 162. Cf. e.g. the Menomini belief. Hoffman p. 177.

^{277a} The bear was eaten at one sitting, the men cooked the meat, the skull was placed on the ground before the fire and the hunters sat in two rows facing each other. Food and tobacco were offered to the animal and each man drank at least one dipper of bear grease. Honorific speeches were made to the bear and its generic name was taboo. D. S. Davidson.

²⁷⁸ Skinner (1), pp. 162-3. The carcass is "dressed up in all the finery obtainable, and is laid out to look like a human being. Women may not eat the tongue and heart. The slayer always gets the brisket, head, and heart.

²⁷⁹ Speck (2), p. 26. Among these people while the feast on the bear's meat is in progress the chief sticks several ribbon streamers (made from cleft twigs split to hold the ribbon) into the head. "Then the head itself is impaled on a stick and, carrying this in his hand, the chief dances twice around the company, singing a tune to a burden of syllables. After this performance the chief plants the stick with the head upon it in the middle of the spread before all the guests, where it is left." After the feast is over the head is given to the oldest and most venerable man. He takes it home or shares it.

²⁸⁰ Henry, pp. 143-5, recounting the killing of a bear, says that after it was skinned and they had "reached the lodge, the bear's head was adorned with all the trinkets in the possession of the family, such as silver arm bands and wrist bands and belts of wampum; and then laid upon a scaffold, set up for its reception within the lodge. Near the nose was placed a large quantity of tobacco." At the feast the next day tobacco smoke was blown into the nostrils of the animal as a very important part of the procedure. Henry was especially urged to do this. *Copway*, p. 30, refers to a bear's head and paws being "festooned with colored cloth and ribbons and suspended at the upper end of the Indians' lodge." Tobacco was also put at the nose.

²⁸¹ Skinner (4), pp. 541-2 " . . . a mark is made on its (the bear's) forehead and on the back of its neck with yellow ochre and a pile of red cloth is put on its head. A pipe is offered to all the gods and the dream guardians of those present. The bear is always so treated after having been brought into the slayer's tent where it is laid out in the guest's place." A speech to the bear figures prominently in this case as part of the feast.

²⁸² Skinner (4), p. 510. At the time the bear was killed the tip of its nose was cut off and a few short sticks were painted, using one of the bear's claws for a brush, and placed with the muzzle. The head with the brisket and paws were next cut off and cooked, after which the feast began. During this, he says, "The bear's nose lay exposed nearby, lying amid various sacrificial offerings." "No part of the bear's flesh was taboo to any one," although one informant stated that children should not eat the paws "lest they should acquire the savage nature of the brute while young and impressionable."

data are scanty, similar customs with minor variations were evidently practiced. In addition to a tobacco offering, trinkets, cloth, ribbon or other objects were placed on the carcass or head of the slain bear and in eating of the beast, certain observances and restrictions had to be carried out.

Some of the Assiniboine are reported to practice customs which closely resemble those of the peoples just described, a feature which differentiates them so clearly from the most typical Prairie tribes, that we may group them with the Algonkian speaking peoples.²⁸³

Central Algonkian.—The evidence for bear ceremonialism in this region is scanty but, from the accounts recorded by early observers, it seems quite certain that rites similar to those found in other Algonkian tribes at one time existed. Perrot refers to the custom of placing a pipe in a dead bear's snout and blowing smoke into its mouth; also to the practice of preserving the tongue string and using it for purposes of divination.²⁸⁴ In the Jesuit Relations²⁸⁵ and Charlevoix²⁸⁶ we find practically identical statements regarding a people located on the Bay of Puans who may have been a branch of the Forest Pottawatomi. They not only venerated the bear, but held a feast in which the painted head of

²⁸³ De Smet (1), p. 139. "The Assiniboine address prayers to the bear. They offer it sacrifices of tobacco, belts, and other esteemed objects. They celebrate feasts in its honor, to obtain its favor and to live without accidents. The bear's head is often preserved in the camp during several days, mounted in some suitable position and adorned with scraps of scarlet cloth, and trimmed with a variety of necklace collars and colored feathers. Then they offer it the calumet, and ask it that they may be able to kill all the bears they meet, without accident to themselves in order to anoint themselves with his fine grease and make a banquet of his tender flesh."

²⁸⁴ Blair, I, pp. 128-9. The string was heated and by its crackling and twisting, one was able to predict whether or not other bears would be killed. The passage which appears in Charlevoix (p. 118) referring to the same custom is so similar in both content, sequence of details, and even diction, that it is fairly evident that Perrot was the source from which it was taken. We have previously drawn attention to other reasons for our suspicions in the discussion of the paw-sucking belief.

²⁸⁵ Jes. Rel., LVI, p. 127. "Carefully saving the animal's head, they paint it with the finest colors they can find and during the feast, they place it in an elevated position, to receive the worship of all the guests and the praises they bestow upon it, one after another, in their choicest songs."

²⁸⁶ p. 300

the beast was placed in an elevated position where homage was rendered to it. Father Allouez²⁸⁷ says that the Miami "ate the bear at the beginning (of the feast) and afterward they adored its skin."

Among the Menomini there seems to be the trace of a ceremonial feast, perhaps originally connected with the bear alone, but which is now ostensibly made to the *sun* after a bear is killed.²⁸⁸ Although objectively it suggests certain features of the bear feasts of other Algonkian peoples, the erection of a pole to which is attached a deer skin with a representation of the sun upon it, savors of Plains practices. On its subjective side, also a cultural emanation from this direction seems evident. The host, for instance, must have dreamed of the sun and thus obtained war powers in consideration of such sacrifice. The sun is also addressed in the course of the ceremonies. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the occasion for the affair appears to be the killing of a bear; the head is dished up separately and eaten only by the braves and the bones of the beast are treated in a way similar to that of the northern and eastern Algonkians. These features suggest some relationship to the custom of the latter tribes.²⁸⁹

Southeastern area

No rites accompanying the killing or eating of a bear have been reported for the peoples of this region or for Iroquois tribes.²⁹⁰

Mackenzie area

For the northern Athabascans of the Canadian forests and tundra, ethnological details are so scanty, or entirely lacking, that it is impossible to make any positive statement regarding the occurrence or absence of such practices as we have under review.

²⁸⁷ Jes. Rel. of 1672, Chap. XII (quoted Blair, I, p. 132, note 99).

²⁸⁸ Skinner (3), p. 213.

²⁸⁹ Cf. Skinner's statement (5), p. 177. A much more aberrant practice attributed to the Fox (see Owen, p. 55) is the scalping of a bear after killing it and, if we understand correctly, the cremation of the rest of the body.

²⁹⁰ Except the customs observed by members of the Little Water Society of the Seneca already referred to. It seems quite likely that the Iroquois, since their intrusion into an area previously peopled by Algonkian tribes, should have absorbed some of the customs of the latter.

When we take into account, however, the other traces of bear veneration found in some of these tribes, scanty though they be, as well as basic northern culture traits which these peoples share with the Algonkian peoples of the sub-arctic northeast, it is not unlikely that future investigation may reveal traces of bear rites comparable to those found elsewhere in the north.²⁹¹

Plateau area

The tribes of this region have been sufficiently investigated for us to state with a fair amount of certainty that no ceremonial treatment of a bear's carcass was practiced, although the animal was held in high repute and certain other customs, as we shall later see, are found in this area which connect it with eastern North America and Asia.²⁹²

Plains area

Although the people of the Plains had a high respect for the bear,²⁹³ yet we do not find that any rites were performed in connection with the slaughter of the animal except by the Plains Cree, Plains Ojibway, and the Assiniboine.²⁹⁴ Indeed there seems to have

²⁹¹ Chapman, p. 304, writes that the Tinnah of the Lower Yukon, when hunting bears or other animals, believe they are "really hunting souls, which have those forms as presentments." The spirits of the game are charmed by songs. In respect to the bear he says that women are forbidden the meat and that the men eat the beast's heart to obtain courage. No information regarding the treatment of the bear after killing it is given.

²⁹² Curtis, vol. VII, pp. 140-1, describes a Kutenai ceremony which he says was observed in the spring in order to secure immunity from attack by grizzlies. It was initiated by the man who first dreamed of a bear at this season and each participant wished the animal good luck during the summer and petitioned the same fortune for himself. The animal was also asked not to send illness. A kind of altar, of which a bear skull was the central feature, was arranged in the dreamer's lodge and the people of the village came in to make their supplications. The occasion for this ceremony, as well as its objective features, and its whole psychological content are radically different from the features of the complex under discussion in this paper. It obviously has nothing to do with the hunting and killing of the animal and the consumption of the flesh which is the economic matrix in which the ceremonies under discussion so especially function.

²⁹³ See, e.g., Schultz, p. 106; Belden, p. 137; G. B. Grinnell (personal communication 11.18.24); Reed, p. 238.

²⁹⁴ We may assume, I think, that the contact of these peoples with northern tribes of a forest culture who have bear rites is responsible for this fact. Their geo-

been some hesitancy about killing grizzly bears at all in some tribes²⁹⁵ and even though killed the flesh of bears was not always eaten.²⁹⁶ Bear skins were not always utilized either, which may be connected with the taboo mentioned by several writers which forbids a woman to handle a bear's hide.²⁹⁷

North Pacific Coast area

Although the bear, as compared with other animals, played a relatively unimportant role in the beliefs and practices of the Indians of the North Pacific Coast, whose culture was so much more elaborate and distinctive than the peoples we have hitherto described, yet there are indications that rites were formerly observed which are comparable to those recorded for tribes east of the Rockies on the one hand, and Asiatic customs on the other.

The data which are available come from three representative peoples, the Nootka, Kwakiutl, and Tlingit.

Jewitt gives the earliest description for the Nootka.²⁹⁸ "After well cleansing the bear from the dirt and blood, with which it is generally covered when killed, it is brought in and seated opposite the king in an upright posture, with a chief's bonnet, wrought in figures, on its head and its fur powdered over with the white down. A tray of provisions is then set before it, and it is invited by

graphical position suggests it and there is other evidence. See e.g., McGee (15 Rep. B.A.E.), p. 189 ff. and Skinner (4), p. 529. Cf. Wissler (1), p. 208.

²⁹⁵ Grinnell, I, p. 290, says the Cheyenne kill black bears but not the grizzly; Belden (p. 137) and Schultz (pp. 106, 109) cite this sort of an attitude for the Crow, but cf. Lowie (3), p. 358, who refers to the use of a tanned bear hide in the Bear Song Dance. This ceremony, it may be noted, is periodic and has nothing to do *per se* with the killing of a bear or the propitiation of the animal's "spirit"; "it united all those harboring in a mysterious manner an animal or some object in their bodies." On hearing the song these individuals were compelled to show the object or animal part to the spectators.

²⁹⁶ Mr. Grinnell writes me: "I do not think that I have known of the eating of the flesh of the grizzly bear, and, in fact, I might say of any bear, by any of the plains people." This is in marked contrast to other peoples, notably those of the north and Asiatic tribes too, who greatly relish bear meat.

²⁹⁷ e.g., Cheyenne (Grinnell, II, pp. 105, 198); Blackfoot (Schultz, p. 110 seq.) Grinnell in a letter remarks, "I feel sure that I have never seen a bear hide in a Black-foot lodge."

²⁹⁸ Pp. 95-96.

words and gestures to eat. This mock ceremony over, the reason of which I could never learn, the animal is taken and skinned, and the flesh and entrails boiled up into a soup, no part but the paunch being rejected." He adds that this is called "dressing the bear," an occasion of "great rejoicing throughout the village."

The account which Curtis gives of the Kwakiutl is also worth quoting. The procedure closely parallels that given by Jewitt, although several details of interest are added. It is to be noted that he states that the ceremony follows the killing of the *first* bear of the season. "The hunter," he says, "would bring it to the village, and while yet a short distance away he would call, 'I have a visitor!' Then all of the people very solemnly and quietly would assemble in his house. The bear was placed in a sitting posture in the place of honor at the middle of the back part of the room, with a ring of cedar bark about its neck and eagle down on its head. Food was then given to each person and a portion was placed before the bear. Great solemnity prevailed. The bear was treated as an honored guest, and was so addressed in the speeches. The people, one by one, would advance and take its paws in their hands as if uttering a supplication. After the ceremonial meal was over, the bear was skinned and prepared for food."²⁹⁹ Another Kwakiutl procedure is described as follows: "When a black bear is killed, the hunter steps up to it and says: 'Thank you, friend, for meeting me. I did not do any harm to you. You came to meet me sent by our creator that I should shoot you that I may eat together with my wife and friend.' Thus he says and after he has said this he turns the bear over and places the blade of the knife at the chin of the bear and pretends to cut it. This is repeated three times. The fourth time he really cuts. He takes off the skin. Then he takes the skin with the right hand at the head and with the left hand at the small of the back, holds up the skin, and if it is a female bear he will say, 'Now, friend, call your husband to come

²⁹⁹ Curtis, x, p. 38. Goldenweiser (1), p. 207, quoting from unpublished MS material of Dr. Boas, refers to ceremonies connected with slain land-otters, beavers, raccoons, and martens, which are quite different in character. He says that a bear is treated similarly "or a loop is put through its nose, and the body is then hung up in a corner of the house."

to me also.' Then he throws down the skin on the body of the bear. He takes it up again and says, 'Now call your father to come here also.' Again he throws down the skin and says, holding it up, 'Oh friend, call your mother to come here also.' Then he throws down the skin on the body. He holds up the skin and says, 'Now call your children to come here also, and throws down the skin on the body. Then the hunter himself answers his prayer saying, 'I am going to do so.' ''^{299a}

Among the Tlingit, it was the head of a slain grizzly which was "carried indoors and eagle down and red paint were put on it."³⁰⁰ The Tsimshian, after skinning a bear, painted it with red ochre on the back, "forming a line running from head to tail." Some of it was also put under the arms.³⁰¹ We have no record, however, of any treatment of the carcass or head such as has been just described for the Nootka, Kwakiutl, and Tlingit.

In the southern and altogether less typical reaches of the North Pacific area we do not find any traces of bear ceremonialism.³⁰²

*California—Great Basin*³⁰³

An examination of data on California tribes, respecting a ceremonial treatment of slain bears, yields almost completely negative results. Powers³⁰⁴ says that the Wailaki performed a dance after killing a bear and one of Gifford's Miwok informants said that, in former times, it was customary to show respect "to the bear, the eagle and the falcon after any of these had been killed. This was done by laying the body of the slain creature on a blanket and having a little feast in honor of it when it was brought to the hunter's home." This was not a ceremony in any way connected with the moieties or totemic groups. Its purpose was to appease the animal or its spirit.³⁰⁵ It is possible, of course, that such a

^{299a} Letter Dr. Franz Boas.

³⁰⁰ Swanton (2), p. 455.

³⁰¹ Boas (7) p. 283.

³⁰² Among e.g. the Coos, Siuslaw, Alsea (Yakonan), Kalopuya, Molala (Wailat-puaw), Quileute. Letter Dr. Leo J. Frachtenberg Dec. 26, 1924.

³⁰³ See Kroeber (1) for a characterization of this area.

³⁰⁴ p. 118.

³⁰⁵ Gifford (1), pp. 144-5. Through correspondence with Mr. Gifford, I was able to ascertain that no further details regarding this custom are available: Letter March 31, 1924. Cf. remarks *re* condor, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

ceremony may represent a remnant of more elaborate rites and beliefs connected with bears, but on the other hand, it may merely indicate an extension to the bear of ceremonials practiced in connection with the other animals mentioned, or a pattern equally applicable to all animals.

The Ute³⁰⁶ and Southern Paiute³⁰⁷ perform a Bear Dance intended to conciliate the animal before it emerges from its winter hibernation³⁰⁸ but there is no record of any ceremonies connected with the hunting and killing of the bear. "Before the ceremony," however, "the picture of a bear is made on cloth and fastened flag-fashion to a tall staff, which is set in the rear of the dance ground."³⁰⁹ According to Reed, the enclosure in which the dance is performed symbolizes the bear's den and the performance itself, the gradual restoration of the animal from its winter repose.

Southwest area

In several of the Pueblo towns,³¹⁰ it was customary after killing a bear, to treat the animal like a dead human enemy, the slayer of the bear being called war chief for the time being.³¹¹ Beads were strung around the dead bear's paws³¹² and there was formerly a war dance.³¹³ Eaters of bear meat had to paint their faces black. At Jemez there is a dance for a dead bear and also a ritual to convert the dead enemy into a friend.³¹⁴ At Zuni the crania of

³⁰⁶ See Reed and Lowie (1), pp. 823-31. It is called *mamaqunikap!* Lowie comments, p. 823, that "the native name is said to contain no reference to the bear."

³⁰⁷ Lowie (2), pp. 299-302. According to this observer it has been recently borrowed from the Ute and appears to be a purely social affair.

³⁰⁸ There is a certain similarity in motivation, but not in objective features, to the ceremony of the Kutenai. Cf. also R. B. Dixon (3), N. Maidu, pp. 295-6, who describes a dance supposed to make the bear less dangerous to the hunter. Observances which are part of the preparation for the hunt, however, are outside of our subject.

³⁰⁹ Lowie (1) p. 827 and fig. 3.

³¹⁰ Hopi and Tewa of First Mesa. (I am indebted to Dr. E. C. Parsons for the following information on the Pueblo area.)

³¹¹ *Kahlektaka* (Hopi), *p'otali* (Tewa).

³¹² In the case of deer they were put around the throat and corn was put on the heart and in the mouth.

³¹³ Dr. Parsons' middle aged informant had never seen a bear killed.

³¹⁴ "The slayer of a bear is expected on his return to town to stop about a mile out, and to shout as in war. All the men go out with rifle to meet him, each receiving

bears as well as those of other animals are placed in a cave with prayer sticks. Other animals, such as the deer³¹⁵ and antelope,³¹⁶ are likewise the object of ceremonies after being killed.

There is also an association of the bear with medicine in most of the Pueblos (Hopi and Taos excepted).³¹⁷ The animal "is the doctor *par excellence*." At Zuni, e.g., "White bear and Black Bear are foremost among the medicine animals of the curing society. They are represented on the painted slats of the society altars,³¹⁸ and as stone fetiches. Prayer-sticks are offered to the Bear by the society members and the animal appears as a Kachina in the mask cult." Bear paws or claws appear in the paraphernalia of shamans or society doctors.³¹⁹

a piece of bear meat which he wraps around the barrel of his rifle. They all ride into town, the slayer in their midst, across his horse the bear. The women come out, armed with pokers and with which they strike at the bear. Singing, the men escort the slayer to his house. The relatives of the slayer tie feathers, and take them and meal to the chiefs of the Arrow head society and the Fire society, asking them to wash the bear for them. The chiefs say yes, and they are given four days in which to prepare. On the fifth day the altar (only one altar, that of either society) is set up, in any room large enough, and the ceremony is performed. The appointed *opi* attend, dressed as Masewi. Besides the bathing (*ahu*), the legs of the bear are cut off and given to a member of the society which has set up the altar. The recipient becomes the younger brother of the slayer. Food is contributed by the *opi*, to be eaten by any visitors, males; no women attend the ceremony. Whatever food is left over is kept by the society members." (Dr. Parsons' MS).

³¹⁵ Stevenson (2), p. 440. Mrs. Esther Goldfrank has collected data at Isleta pertaining to these customs.

³¹⁶ Stevenson (1), p. 120; also (2), *op. cit.*

³¹⁷ "Probably other Tanoan towns also," writes Dr. Parsons, "but not including Jemez. Among the Tewa of First Mesa, neighbors of the Hopi, the old term for doctor is *kiah*, bear. Their Bear Kachina, with bear hide and paws, is said to have been brought by them from their Rio Grande home." At Taos, "there is a Bear society in charge of a winter ceremonial, and the supreme war spirit is Red Bear, to whom prayer feathers are offered." There is also a society which cares for persons wounded by bears. "Informants insist that they have not the bear medicine of the other Pueblos, of which they are much afraid." Dr. Parsons thus concludes that at Taos the animal is associated only with war, not with medicine.

³¹⁸ M. C. Stevenson, The Zuni, 23 Rep. B.A.E. (2)

³¹⁹ Keres, Jemez (Dr. Parsons' MS), Isleta (communication, Mrs. Esther S. Goldfrank). Cf. Dumarest, p. 187; Stevenson, (1). For additional information in respect to the bear's medical aspect consult Parsons (1), pl. IV, p. 120; Dumarest, pp. 187, 199, n. 5, pp. 234-6.

As Dr. Parsons points out, therefore, the bear "has both characters, war and medicine, among the Pueblos,³²⁰ in some places, one character being to the fore, in other places, the other."

Eskimo area

Although there were many taboos and special observances practiced in connection with the hunting of game animals³²¹ by the American Eskimo and some of these applied to the bear, yet there were no ceremonial rites observed after killing these animals comparable to those found elsewhere. In some groups it is customary to attach the bear's bladder,³²² and sometimes other parts,³²³ to a stick which is placed upright near an encampment for three days.³²⁴ On the West coast of Hudson's Bay "a piece of the tongue and other small parts are hung up in the hut, and knives, saws, drills, and other small objects are attached to them as

³²⁰ The Indians of the S. W. are not unique in the medical character they impute to the bear, although the information for other peoples is far from satisfactory. The Cheyenne believe the bear can cure itself if wounded (Grinnell, II, p. 105). See also Densmore, p. 195; for the E. Cree, Skinner (1), p. 76, says that the bear is considered to have greater medicine powers than mankind; the Penobscot also say that the bear knows a great deal about medicine. Barrett's "Pomo Bear Doctors" is interesting in this connection.

³²¹ See, e.g., Boas (1), p. 595, for customs connected with the Sedna myth, also (2), p. 119 *seq.*, and for miscellaneous observances p. 489 and p. 499 ff.; Nelson, pp. 379-393, for an account of the Bladder Feast. Mr. D. Jenness has kindly furnished me with the following excerpt from G. M. Stoney, *Explorations in Alaska*. Proceedings of the U. S. Naval Institute, vol. xxv p. 839. It refers to the Eskimo of the Kobuk River, Alaska. The bear (species uncertain) is skinned and the head cut off. The latter is then taken by a hunter who "standing astride the body with the head in both hands, raises it high in the air and lowers it three times, touching the body each time just over the heart and muttering an incantation. After the third touch he throws the head with all his might so as to hit the same spot over the heart and utters a loud shout in which all the natives join." This ceremony drives the bear's spirit to the mountains. The abdomen of the bear is not opened in the presence of white men and certain parts must be left on the ground.

³²² Boas (1), p. 596 (Central Eskimo).

³²³ Boas (2), p. 124. The Cumberland Sound people take the animal's "bladder, milt, sweetbreads, and gall, and some man's tools, such as fire drill, knife, spear point, and file and hang all on a pole." When a female animal is killed the same parts are hung up with women's tools.

³²⁴ This is the period during which the bear's soul remains near the place where it left the body, Boas (2), p. 124. Work is sometimes suspended for the same period after a bear is killed. See Boas (2), p. 147. Cf. C. F. Hall, II, p. 575.

presents to the bear's soul. It is believed that then the soul will go to the other bears and tell them how well it has been treated so that the others may be willing to be caught.³²⁵ At the end of three days, the man who killed the bear takes down the objects, carries them out into the passageway, and then throws them into the house where the boys stand ready to get what they can. This symbolizes the bear spirit presenting these objects to the people. The boys must return the objects to their owners. During these three days, the women are not allowed to comb their hair."³²⁶

EURASIA

In Siberia and northern Europe we find plenty of evidence which points to the widespread distribution and probably ancient character of the custom of treating slain bears with ceremonious respect. Yet the actual observances themselves show a considerable range of variation, and the degree of elaboration to which the rites have been carried differs enormously in the various regions surveyed. Lacking the well defined areas of culture characterization which have been worked out for North America, and which were followed in our summary of bear rites on that continent, I have, nevertheless, followed a regional grouping of peoples in reviewing the Eurasian material also. That is to say, I have classified together the tribes whose bear rites are sufficiently similar to enable one to say that they are more like each other in this respect than they are to the people of any other region. The customs of the northeastern Siberians are first discussed. These tribes have very simple rites and they are not as exclusively practiced in connection with bears as is the case elsewhere. Central Siberia is taken up next, then Western Siberia, followed by the Finns and Lapps of Northern Europe. Finally, there is a return to eastern Asia, to what I have termed the Amur-Gulf of Tartary region. It includes the tribes of the islands of Saghalin and Yezo as well as the Amur peoples. I have postponed a description of the rites performed in this region until last because it is here that the typical

³²⁵ This idea finds its closest parallels among Asiatic peoples.

³²⁶ Boas (2), p. 501.

bear festival occurs,³²⁷ a periodic celebration prepared for long in advance and altogether a very elaborate socio-religious event. It is never performed in connection with any other animal and the beast is clearly the focus of all the important steps in the ritual. In short, bear ceremonialism reaches its peak in the Amur-Gulf of Tartary region and after a description of the Gilyak and Ainu festivals, we shall indicate the probable connection between these elaborate ceremonies and the simpler rites which are practiced so much more extensively.

Northeastern Siberia

The observance of certain rites in connection with slain animals is one of the most characteristic features of the ethnology of the northeastern Siberian tribes. Consequently, we find that in some cases the ceremonies performed after killing a bear in no wise differ, in their general or even specific features, from those of which other animals are the object. The purpose of these ceremonies seems to be connected with a conceptualization of nature which is common to all of these peoples. It is believed that the natural features of their environment and the various species of animals with which they are acquainted all have their respective spiritual "owners" or "masters."³²⁸ It is only through the beneficence of these "owners" that the game animals may be caught, for these creatures are under supernatural control. The notion is also held that the spirit of the slain animal will report to its congeners the kind of treatment it receives at the hands of man; hence the cordial reception and hospitality rendered such creatures

³²⁷ Usually an annual event in each community.

³²⁸ See Jochelson (2), p. 234. This investigator defines them as "invisible, anthropomorphic beings dwelling in one or another division of nature, or in separate objects which they possess. They live, like men, in families. Generally, the Owners are benevolent deities, provided men observe the customs established in regard to them, and do not transgress certain taboos. Only the Yakut Owners . . . are spirits inimical to man." The concept is less clearly developed among the Koryak (Jochelson [3], p. 30) than in the other tribes. The Yukaghir "believe that each species of animal has its protector, *mōyē*, who is subject to the main owners, and an individual protector, *pējul*," as well. Without the latter's consent the animal cannot be killed. This spiritual guardian of the individual animals is not paralleled in the other tribes. (Jochelson [2], p. 146).

as the whale and the bear. If properly treated, animals will be caught again and again; if not, poor hunting luck will result. It must be emphasized, however, that the animal *per se* is not *conceptually* the focus of the ceremonies, although all of the objective demonstrations might lead one to suppose so. It is characteristically the spirit "owner" of the animal which seems to be of prime importance, the animal being more or less subject to the control of this supernatural being.

Asiatic Eskimo.—A ceremony is performed over slain polar bears by the Asiatic Eskimo,³²⁹ which is similar to that observed by them any time that a whale is killed.³³⁰ After being brought to the village the carcass of the bear is skinned, "but the head, the neck and the shoulders are left with the skin. This receives a "drink"³³¹ before the entrance (to the hut), and a sacrifice of sausage, and is then brought into the house and into the sleeping room, where it is put on the master's side and in the place of honor. ". . . a big lamp burns all the time near the symbolized game; also a *pinte* fire,³³² which figures in all the ceremonials of the Chukchee." The head and skin are left in position for five days and nights during which period constant attention is paid to them. Both men and women, for example, will take off their bead necklaces and hang them over the "bear's" neck. Frequent libations of water and sacrifices of various meats are also made. In fact Bogoras says that when a bear (or whale) is in the house "neither of them is left alone for a moment" . . . because, it is said, "the guest will feel lonely." Loud noises are also taboo, lest "the guest should be awakened from his repose."³³³ "All the drums are hung in the outer tent, near the entrance" and if one of them is accidentally struck it is beaten lightly as if in punishment. The chil-

³²⁹ Polar bears are, however, very scarce on the Pacific shore. Bogoras (2), p. 406.

³³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 407.

³³¹ i.e., a libation of warm water is poured over the head of the animal, a characteristic Chukchi practice as well. Cf. Boas (2), p. 147-8, who refers to the same practice in connection with seals by the Eskimo of the west coast of Hudson Bay and (p. 489) Cumberland Sound. No mention is made of a similar treatment of bears.

³³² A special fire before the entrance to the dwelling made especially for sacrificial purposes. See Bogoras (2), p. 378.

³³³ *Ibid.*, p. 407.

dren are not allowed to be noisy or boisterous, but should they be so, a drum is lightly beaten in expiation of the "uncivil behavior toward the guest." After the ceremonial period has elapsed the head is "cooked in a big kettle and then a feast is arranged, to which all the neighbors are invited. The meat of the head must be entirely eaten.³³⁴"

Chukchi.—While the animals with which ceremonials are connected are not identical among the Reindeer and Maritime Chukchi, the essential features of the rites observed conform to the same fundamental pattern. Thus, the ceremony which the Reindeer Chukchi observe after the killing of the wild bucks found in the herd during the rutting season, is homologous with the rites performed over a bear's carcass and over that of other animals.³³⁵ It is likewise similar to the observances after the hunt of the walrus and seal by the Maritime Chukchi and Asiatic Eskimo.³³⁶

The essential features of the ceremony are as follows: Reindeer are slaughtered,³³⁷ a sacrifice to the fire is made,³³⁸ ceremonial dishes are cooked, the head of the bear is taken indoors where it is greeted with songs and drum beating. Sometimes the master of the house will put on the bear's skin so that the skin of the animal's head covers his, and the rest of it hangs behind.³³⁹

³³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 408. Cf. Nelson's description of the Eskimo bladder festival, p. 383. Bogoras, in a footnote, says that Steller reports that among the Kamchadal "it is forbidden to sing aloud when a fresh sable-skin is brought into the house."

³³⁵ Bogoras (2), pp. 379-381. The wolverene and elk are considered worthy of such rites.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 379. "Since the ceremonial connected with the hunt of walrus and larger kinds of seal is performed about the same season and with somewhat similar details by both the Maritime Chukchee and the Asiatic Eskimo, it is my opinion that the purpose of this ceremonial is to celebrate success in the hunt. I believe it is connected with the bucks killed in the herd simply because they represent among the Reindeer Chukchee the most important game hunted. With the Reindeer Chukchee the ceremonial has a special name, *ēnaičūrgin*. The Maritime Chukchee call the ceremonial connected with walrus-hunting by this name; and the Maritime Koryak apply it, with the proper phonetic change, to the ceremonial of the whale."

³³⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 380. The Maritime Chukchi can, of course, only slaughter dogs when a bloody sacrifice is required (p. 386). Only polar bears are found in the habitat of these people. (Verbal information, Dr. Jochelson.)

³³⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 378.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3. 1.

At other seasons than the fall, the ceremonies are much simpler in their character.³⁴⁰ After the hunt of the bear, and, in fact, any of the larger animals, the beast will be given a "drink"³⁴¹ and a "bed."³⁴² The Maritime people practice the "drink giving" in connection with all of the animals killed on the hunt but they often omit giving them a bed.

Koryak.—Ceremonies are performed when bears are slain by both the Maritime and Reindeer Koryak.³⁴³ When the dead bear is brought into the house, the women come out to meet it, dancing, with fire brands. The bear skin is taken off with the head, and one of the women puts on the skin, dances in it, and entreats the bear not to be angry, but to be kind to them. At the same time some meat is put onto a wooden platter, and they say, "Eat, friend."³⁴⁴ The food referred to, is presented to a wooden figure representing a bear.³⁴⁵ The final act of the ceremony is to equip the beast for the "home journey."³⁴⁶ The Maritime Koryak

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 381. They resemble more closely the procedure followed by the Asiatic Eskimo in the case of the bear, already described.

³⁴¹ i.e., *ibid.*, p. 378. Also note on Asiatic Eskimo.

³⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 378. This is symbolized by "placing a small willow-twigg under the hind-quarters of the carcass for a bed." Giving the animals a "bed" seems also to be absent from the animal ceremonies of the Asiatic Eskimo.

³⁴³ Jochelson's descriptions are based on verbal information. He says that the "ceremonies performed after hunting wild reindeer or other land animals are the same among the Maritime and Reindeer Koryak. They are particularly elaborate after successful bear or wolf hunting." (3), p. 88.

³⁴⁴ Jochelson (3), pp. 88-9. Both the Maritime and Reindeer Koryak perform similar rites after killing a wolf. (*Op. cit.*) Bastian, III, p. 26, mentions the ceremonies for bears and wolves.

³⁴⁵ See *ibid.*, fig. 39. This feature is analogous to the whale festival of the Maritime people in which an image is used, p. 72.

³⁴⁶ As in the case of the whale, also, the notion is entertained that the animal killed has come on a visit to the village and must be well treated in order to secure good hunting in the future and also to protect the people from any anger on the part of its congeners. Speaking of the whale, Jochelson (*op. cit.*, p. 66) says that it will return to the sea to repeat its visit the following year, and that, if hospitably received, it will bring its relatives with it when it comes again. Hence, it is symbolically equipped with grass traveling bags filled with puddings for its return to the sea. The home-sending of the bear is called *kénninatixathtyñin* (bear service), p. 88. The term for the brown bear is *koi'nin*. *Ibid.*, p. 554. The wolf rites lack the equipment for the home journey as the animal is not used for food, and its return is obviously not desired. It is feared more on account of the supernatural potencies attributed to it than of ferociousness, see p. 98.

prepare puddings for it and travelling provisions, the former being put into an especially plaited grass bag. "The Reindeer Koryak slaughter a reindeer for the bear,³⁴⁷ cook all the meat and pack it in a grass bag. The bear skin is filled with grass, taken out and carried around the house, following the course of the sun, and then sent away in the direction of the rising sun. The stuffed bear and the bag are put on the platform of the store house, and after a few days the skin is taken back to be tanned, and the puddings are eaten."³⁴⁸

Kamchadal.—The available data regarding these people are of the most meager kind. Although they are inveterate bear killers,³⁴⁹ their rites are of the simplest sort. One early observer says that it was their custom to stick a knife into each eye of the beast before skinning it.³⁵⁰ The honor accruing to the hunter who kills a bear is especially emphasized in the early accounts, and to the feast which followed, friends and neighbors were always invited.³⁵¹ Georgi refers to the practice of handing a piece of meat to a guest who "grasps it in his hand, takes a bite, and passes it to his next neighbor." In one account it is said that during the feast the host would produce the beast's head, wrap it in grass, and hang various

³⁴⁷ As do the Reindeer Chukchi at certain seasons. The Koryak also make a similar sacrifice after killing a wolf, p. 90. Consult Jochelson's discussion of bloody sacrifices, p. 90 *seq.*

³⁴⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 89.

³⁴⁹ Dr. Jochelson tells me that as many as 100 bears are killed in a single season. Their principal economic pursuit is fishing and nowadays, at least, they hunt sea mammals very little.

³⁵⁰ Dobell, vol. I, p. 19. "This they said was absolutely necessary as bears sometimes have been known to recover, even after several severe wounds, and kill the persons who had cut open their bellies with an intention of skinning them." "Whereas," said they, "if their eyes had first been put out, they could not have seen anything, and those persons would have escaped." The author also attributes the custom of blinding the bear to the Koryak. *Ibid.*, p. 185. The Gilyak (Amur) put out the eyes of seals that they have killed in order that the spirits of the slain animals may not be able to recognize their slayers and spoil the hunt in revenge (Von Schrenck, III, p. 546). The Samoyed cut out the eyes of slain reindeer and bury them in order to ensure good luck in the future (Pallas, III, p. 70).

³⁵¹ Krashenninnikoff, p. 103; Steller, p. 330; Georgi, III, p. 154.

bits of meat around it.³⁵² Respectful and hospitable treatment was also due other animals, to which food of one sort or another was usually offered.³⁵³

Yukaghir.—The Yukaghir, while they do not treat the carcass of a slain bear with the same ceremonial detail as some of the other tribes, maintain an attitude of high respect for the animal.³⁵⁴

Lamut.—In the case of the northern Lamut the only positive hint which we have is contained in the statement of Bogoras³⁵⁵, that they consider the brown bear to be a "shaman and a sorcerer, and in hunting him, they perform many ceremonies for the purpose of appeasing his anger." The meat must "be boiled all at once and eaten by the neighbors of the hunter gathered for the feast, without reserving any for the future." This applies especially to the head.³⁵⁶

Central Siberia

Tungus.³⁵⁷—Miss Czaplicka says that bear veneration is "especially highly developed" among the Northern Tungusic peoples. "When a bear is killed and brought home, a ceremony called *kuk* is held." The heart and liver are cooked and eaten by the men. No women are permitted to be present. "Each person, before eating his piece, bows before the bear and assures him that it was the Russians who killed him, and not the Avankil (Tungus)." It is possible that the carcass or skin of the beast was also the focus of some attention, but of this we cannot be sure, and I have been

³⁵² Steller, p. 331. A somewhat similar treatment of seals' heads is described at length by Krashenninnikoff, see Grieve (pp. 118 *seq.*). These creatures are apparently equipped for the home journey, as are the whale and bear among the Koryak.

³⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 85, 280. On p. 276 he refers to the whale, wolf, narwhal, and bear as being especially venerated.

³⁵⁴ Verbal information, Dr. Jochelson.

³⁵⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 325. The bear is thought to be the elder brother of Torga'nra, the ancestor of the tribe.

³⁵⁶ Bogoras (2), p. 408.

³⁵⁷ See Czaplicka (1) for the subdivisions of the Tungusians. They were originally hunters and fishermen, but in the course of constant peregrinations they adopted various modes of economic life. They are late arrivals in Siberia, their home being in Manchuria (Laufer (5), p. 121).

unable to discover any observances of this nature recorded by any other investigator.³⁵⁸

*Yakut.*³⁵⁹—We have no very satisfactory information regarding the treatment of bears by these people, but they greatly respected the animal,³⁶⁰ and in the apology made to it and in the disposal of its bones they resemble other Siberian tribes. Galitzin refers to the feast held after killing a bear. Care is taken not to break the bones, which are carefully put to one side. During the preparations a statuette representing *Boñnai* is made of clay and this spirit as well as the god of the forest is propitiated. A portion of the soup is poured into the fire by each participant before eating. The spirit of the bear is apostrophized, being told that the Russians or Tungusians were responsible for its death.³⁶¹

It is impossible to discern the precise focus of these propitiations but apparently we have here, as elsewhere, the association of the bear with powerful supernatural beings and it is necessary, therefore, to practice certain conventional observances. As bear ceremonies are not practiced by the people of Central Asia it does not seem improbable that the Yakut may have assimilated the attitudes and practices they evidence toward the bear from the northern aborigines of the region they now occupy, in the same way as they took over reindeer herding. But of this we cannot be certain.

Western Siberia (Tobolsk District)

Ostyak and Vogul.—Practically all of our information for western Siberia is derived from groups which live in the region of the Ob River and its tributaries. Travelers such as Ides, Pallas,³⁶²

³⁵⁸ Czaplicka, *op. cit.* Mr. H. U. Hall has been kind enough to search Miss Czaplicka's notes for further details, but without success.

³⁵⁹ These Turkish speaking nomads are also intrusive in Siberia, probably since the conquests of Ghengis Kahn. They reached their present abode along the valley of the Lena River and a considerable assimilation of the aboriginal Siberians has taken place. See Jochelson (7), p. 258; Czaplicka (9), pp. 41, 52.

³⁶⁰ Shklovsky, p. 22, says of the Yakut of the Kolyma that the brown bear is considered an incarnation of *Ulu-Tayon*, their most terrible god. Cf. Galitzin, who writes that they hold it in "superstitious fear"; Czaplicka (9), p. 48.

³⁶¹ Galitzin, *op. cit.*

³⁶² Pallas, III, p. 64. Also Trusler's translation, p. 317. The custom of hanging the skin on a tree where reverence is paid to it is a practice referred to by this traveler but not mentioned by other observers.

Georgi,³⁶³ Castrén,³⁶⁴ and Erman³⁶⁵ all refer to bear veneration and its accompanying ceremonies among people whom they term Ostyak,³⁶⁶ but none of them give much satisfactory detail. Ahlqvist,³⁶⁷ who started his investigations about 1858, and Sommier, who was a resident in this region for many years, give fuller ethnological accounts of the people, but add little to our knowledge of bear ceremonies. Gondatti, on the other hand, not only exhibits a first-hand knowledge of the country and the people, but has given us an invaluable account of the bear cult of the Vogul and Ugrian Ostyak which far surpasses any of the other sources I have been able to discover which deal with this region.³⁶⁸ I have, therefore, summarized the most important points brought

³⁶³ I, p. 200.

³⁶⁴ Castrén (1), II, p. 59. "Noch heute zu Tage sollen sogar die Ostjaken am Irtysh die Sitte haben, jeden erlegten Bären mit einem Fest zu beehren, wobei Gesang, Tanz, Biertrinken und mehrere Ceremonien, die auch bei Finnen und Lappen gebräuchlich gewesen sind, vorkommen." This author also says, II, p. 295, that the Permians and Siryans had a bear cult in ancient times but he gives no details.

³⁶⁵ Erman, II, p. 43, says that when they kill a bear (or a wolf) "its skin is stuffed with hay, and the people gather round their fallen enemy to celebrate the triumph with songs of mockery and insult. They spit upon it and kick it, and that ceremony performed, they set it upright on its hind legs in a corner of the Yurt, and then, for a considerable time, they bestow on it all the veneration due to a guardian god." The emphasis put upon a ribald treatment of the bear, by this author, prior to more respectful behavior toward it is not borne out by the descriptions of other writers who refer to Ostyak customs. Nor is it paralleled elsewhere so far as our data go. Stuffing the skin with hay, however, is a custom homologous with that of the Koryak and, curiously enough, we have a single reference among the Naskapi to the same general effect.

³⁶⁶ It is impossible to locate with certainty the peoples referred to, for the name Ostyak has been loosely applied to many different groups. Czaplicka (2) divides them into three major branches: (1) Ugrian Ostyaks, (2) Samoyedic Ostyaks, (3) Yenisei Ostyaks. As far as we have been able to determine the matter, our data pertain only to the first branch.

³⁶⁷ Ahlqvist (p. 297), in referring to the beliefs and practices of the Ostyak and Vogul, emphasizes the fact that the bear is the largest and most formidable animal in the territory of the Finno-Ugrian peoples. Although it seldom attacks human beings, the beast is a positive menace to their domestic animals, particularly cattle, and consequently is considered very dangerous. In former times, prior to the introduction of firearms, or earlier still when metals were unknown or but little used, he says, the bear must have appeared in a still more formidable light in relation to man.

³⁶⁸ Published in 1888. Even at this date the customs were rapidly dying out. I am indebted to Miss Mollie Levitzky for a translation of this article from the Russian.

out in his description and have given comparative notes of the statements of other observers.³⁶⁹ But let us turn for a moment to the oldest account of bear veneration among the Ostyak which is to be found in the description of the traveler Ides,³⁷⁰ published in 1706. The section is worth quoting in full:

Once several Ostiacks came on board the ship in which I was, to sell us Fish, and one of my Servants had a Nuremberg-Bear in clock work, which when wound up drummed and turned his head backward and forward, continually moving his Eyes, till the Work was down. Our People set the Bear at play a little: and as soon as ever the Ostiacks saw it, all of them performed to it their customary Religious Worship, and danced excessively to the honour of the Bear, nodding their Heads, and whistling at a great rate. They represented our Bear for a right Saitan,³⁷¹ crying out, What are our Saitans which we make? If we had such a Saitan, we would hang him all over with Sables and Black Fox Skins.³⁷²

Although this description of the behavior of the natives no doubt has its amusing side, yet it exhibits quite characteristically their subjective attitude toward the bear, even though the stimulus itself was so highly artificial. Gondatti gives us considerable insight into the basis of their beliefs in his résumé of a portion of their mythology in which is recounted the origin of the species and its relation to mankind.³⁷³ From this material we are able to make the following deductions.

The animal is certainly not a deity, but is conceived to be under the control of one of their "high gods," *Numi-torum*,³⁷⁴

³⁶⁹ In regard to the Vogul, all that Ahlqvist says is that the dead body of the bear "mit Gesang, Musik und unter Abfeuerung von Schüssen zum Dorfe geschleppt, wo sein Tod sodann mit einem Schmaus und Trinkgelage gefeiert wird" (p. 173).

³⁷⁰ p. 20.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.* "They call their gods Saitan" (p. 20).

³⁷² The natives inquired whether the mechanism was for sale but the pious explorer "ordered it out of their sight, to avoid administering any occasion to Idolatry." The reference to the animal skins which they said they would "hang over" the image is quite reminiscent, in view of the comparative material already presented, of the treatment meted out to the carcass or skin of a slain bear.

³⁷³ See pp. 78-79.

³⁷⁴ Abercromby, I, p. 154. quoting from the discussion of Vogul religion in Munkacsí (Über die heidn. Religion d. Vogulen. Ethnolog. Mitteilungen aus Ungarn, Bd. III, Budapest, 1894) writes that *Numi Tarim* is a sky god transformed into a great hunter, the *bear* being his daughter. He controls the game animals. Cf. Czaplicka (5), p. 289, where a concise discussion of the position of this deity in the native pantheon is given.

although the latter has considerable difficulty in guiding the behavior of his protégé. The fundamental concept seems to be the notion that the activities of the bear are closely associated with the administration of a kind of supernatural justice. No human being is ever killed by a bear unless he has committed some "sin" and the bears which are slain by men are, in turn, those which have disobeyed the injunctions of *Numi-torum*. Both men and bears, in relation to each other, thus become instruments of supernatural justice.³⁷⁵ Furthermore, *Numi-torum* has also prescribed that bears should be esteemed both in life and in death and should any human being be disrespectful to one of these creatures he will be punished by meeting his death in combat with a bear. These ideas thus bring about a sort of duality in the feelings which the natives hold toward the beast. Anyone who feels guilty of any kind of wrongdoing trembles at the sight of a bear, but when the animal is hunted, there is a hidden hope that *Numi-torum* will send the hunter a bear who has "sinned." It is easy to understand, therefore, why it is considered a great honor to successfully kill a bear, but at the same time it is necessary that one apologize to the animal for the deed and perform the proper post mortem ceremonies in order that one's attitude of esteem for the creature may be fully demonstrated, else misfortune or probably death will result.

Let us now turn to an account of the rites themselves.³⁷⁶ After

³⁷⁵ The "oath by the bear," which is highly characteristic of the peoples of northwestern Siberia, becomes intelligible in the light of this ideology. Gondatti writes that a person taking such an oath either gnaws a bear's paw or brandishes an axe three times in front of the skull of a bear (suspended from a tree). At the same time he requests the bear to treat him in a similar manner if he does not keep his oath. See also Ahlqvist, p. 298; Ides, p. 23; Trusler (Pallas), p. 308 (allegiance to a new Russian sovereign was formerly sworn on a bear skin); Castrén, I, p. 309; Kondratowitsch, p. 289. Cf. the analogous custom of the Vogul, Ahlqvist, p. 172. Lasch has collected some data on this subject (chap. 12) and includes the Votyak and Samoyed among the peoples who swear by the bear, in addition to those mentioned above. He refers to the fact that the Russian courts in some districts allowed a bear's skull or skin to be brought in when it was necessary for the natives who entertained this belief to take an oath.

³⁷⁶ If a bear kills one of the hunters the ceremonies are not usually performed. It is then the duty of a brother of the deceased or a near relative to seek out the guilty bear and kill or wound it. If he succeeds, the body, hide, and bones of the beast are burned at the place where the hunter met his death (p. 77).

killing a bear, the hunters throw snow over each other, if it is winter, or in summer, dirt or moss. Before removing the hide they place four or five sticks vertically on the beast's belly to imitate the opening of a coat. The skin is then stripped off the body of the animal, but not from the head and fore paws.³⁷⁷ Both flesh and hide are taken to camp where the women busy themselves in getting a place ready to lay out the latter. Sometimes it is placed upon a large piece of bark or, in some cases, on a plain wooden table if they have one large enough. If the beast is a female they put two pieces of wood under it; if a male, three.³⁷⁸ The chin of the bear is placed between the paws and in front of the animal they put several images of deer made out of bread or birch bark.³⁷⁹ On the eyes they place silver coins³⁸⁰ and to the chin they fasten a "muzzle" made of birch bark.³⁸¹ If the bear is a female they put one or more rings onto its claws.³⁸² It is said that the coins and the "muzzle" are put on because the women are not allowed to look the bear in the eyes or to kiss its lips, a prerogative which belongs to the men exclusively. It is customary, also, for the women to cover their faces with handkerchiefs when they see the animal coming, and before the skin is brought into the house they usually place an axe on the threshold. The women then busy themselves in making preparations for the feast, to which relatives and friends from miles around are invited. It always takes place at night, which is not only traditional, but, from the native point of view, necessary in order to satisfy the "spirit" of the bear.

The festivities continue not less than three days if the animal killed is a cub, four days if it is a female, and five if it is a full

³⁷⁷ Cf. Ahlqvist, p. 298, who refers to the same practice of leaving the skin of the head intact. He also says that the animal is always laid in a place of honor and called "the old one," out of respect.

³⁷⁸ No details are given but there is suggestion here of the northeastern Siberian custom of giving the bear a "bed."

³⁷⁹ This suggests the use of wooden images of the whale and bear in northeastern Siberia, e.g., among the Koryak.

³⁸⁰ Cf. Ahlqvist, p. 298.

³⁸¹ This suggests the bandage put onto the bear's snout by the Gilyak. See Von Schrenck, p. 720. Unfortunately, we have no sketch of the Ostyak device.

³⁸² Cf. Ahlqvist, p. 298.

grown male. If the host has plenty of provisions on hand the feast may continue longer,³⁸³ as, for example, in the autumn, but if a bear is killed in the spring when most of the winter's store of provisions has been exhausted then the celebration will only continue for the minimum traditional period. Neighbors, too, may come to the aid of the host if his provisions run out and sometimes the hide and head of the bear may be transferred to a neighbor's house, even if he has not taken part in the hunt, but is of sufficient means to carry on the festivities in the customary manner.³⁸⁴

When all preparations are made and night has fallen, the festivities begin. The hunter who has killed the bear always seats himself at the right of the animal and places his left hand on the bear's neck. At the left of the beast sit the musicians. An interesting custom which may be mentioned here is the practice of throwing water or snow at those who for the first time enter the house where the bear lies.³⁸⁵ Each newcomer must also kiss the bear's snout. The women do this through a handkerchief without even looking at the bark muzzle fastened to the animal's chin. Most of the night seems to be taken up with singing³⁸⁶ and dancing,³⁸⁷

³⁸³ Two weeks in some cases.

³⁸⁴ Gondatti (p. 74 *seq.*) says that a successful bear hunt may ruin a man for a year because of the outlay required. The news travels very rapidly that so-and-so has killed a bear and as the guests do not have to be especially invited to join in the festivities, one never knows just how many people will turn up. Sometimes people travel hundreds of *vershs* to the celebration. As many as a hundred natives will sometimes come together which, because of the small and scattered population of the country, makes a bear feast an event of the greatest social importance. Indeed, it is such an honor to kill one of these animals that no one hesitates to shoulder the necessary obligations which always follow. Even in Gondatti's time (in the eighties), however, the Russification of the natives was proceeding so rapidly that it was often difficult to find anyone in a particular settlement who was well enough equipped in "bear lore" to guide the natives in the details of the customary procedure. Consequently, the natives would at times send two or three hundred *vershs* for an old man who was acquainted with the proper songs and the details of the ceremonial procedure, for without these the festivities would be of no account.

³⁸⁵ Gondatti says that this is a purification rite and has a religious significance. Mention has already been made of a similar practice by the hunters immediately after they have killed a bear.

³⁸⁶ Cf. Georgi, I, p. 200 Castren (1), II, p. 59.

³⁸⁷ Although no specific details are given there are several references by other observers to dancing as part of the ceremonies observed in connection with a slain

a few special features of which may be noted. Masks are used and in some of the dances men simulate female attire and behavior. The performers are not permitted to look straight into the eyes of the bear and the covering of the face by masks is said to be in accordance with the wishes of the animal. The personalities of the actors are completely obliterated while they are "in character"; they call each other by nicknames and members of the audience must not refer to them by their own names, either. A critical license in speech prevails to such an extent that even Russian officials who may be in attendance are ridiculed with perfect freedom and make no attempt to stop the sharp mockery that goes on.

The performance generally begins each night with a series of songs by two or three of the men who first bow to the bear. The number of songs sung depends upon whether a bear is a cub, a male or a female. In content, these songs refer to the bear, how it walked in the forest, how it found a mate and made a den. They also sing of the animals' life in a former mythological period and of how things were different before the Russians came, when game was plentiful, etc. An intermission follows the singing, during which refreshments are usually served by the host. This is followed by a period during which various dances are performed. In some of these the movements of the bear are imitated³⁸⁸ and they have a magico-religious significance. At the end of each dance and in the earlier part of the evening, after each song, a deep bow is always made to the bear.

During the intervals between the dances by the men, the women and sometimes even the children dance. The former must always keep their faces covered with a handkerchief at this time

bear. Czaplicka (2) says, "after a bear has been killed his body is placed on the ground and the people dance around it"; at the same time they blame the death of the animal on the Russians. Cf. Ahlqvist, p. 298. " . . . heute (circa 1858) bei den ugrischen Völkern das Fallen des Bären mit einem Mahl, Tanz und allerlei Spassen gefeiert" Castern (2) II, p. 59 Sommer. p. 166.

³⁸⁸ Sommer says (p. 166), "I was told that when the Ostyaks have killed the bear they pass the night dancing special dances around the victim. In these dances they represent the episodes of the hunt, one of the men taking the part of the bear and mimicking its motions." See also p. 217 for a description of a mimetic bear dance.

and hide their hands in their sleeves so that the bear will not see any part of their bodies uncovered.

At some time during the feast the slayer of the bear will occasionally leave the house taking a bow and arrow with him. Without looking, he shoots an arrow at the house. Depending upon the position of the beam which the arrow strikes, the hunter in this way is able to determine what his future luck in bear hunting will be. If his arrow, for example, strikes the highest beam, it signifies that he will kill another bear within the year. On the other hand if he hits any of the lower beams it will be a longer period of time, depending on a somewhat variable scheme of interpretation.

Another form of divination, with the same object in view, is practiced on the last night of the feast. When the hide of the bear is being carried out of the house, where it has lain during the period of celebration, the slayer bends down and usually whispers in the animal's ear. He asks whether another bear will be killed soon and who, among those present, will be the slayer. Names are mentioned and the ease with which the skin can be lifted determines the bear's answer.

The hide is carried into the open at daybreak and at this time also, the men throw snow at one another and wrestle. The women do not go out with the men, but before the skin is carried forth they throw snow and water at each other. During the course of the festivities part of the bear's meat has been eaten, but the consumption of the portions which are the special prerogative of each sex does not take place until afterwards. The men prepare and eat their share (the head, heart, and paws) in the woods, while the women cook and eat the hindquarters of the bear in the dwelling where they have remained. It is customary after eating to wipe the hands and mouth with shavings³⁸⁹ and to throw these into the fire. They are also very careful to burn up any remains of the meat, no matter how small, so that the dogs may not get hold of any part of the bear's flesh.

Samoyed (Asiatic).—I have not been able to discover any

³⁸⁹ Cf. Von Schrenck, p. 725, who refers to the same practice among the Oltscha.

reference to a ceremonial treatment of the bear's carcass among any of the Samoyedic peoples,³⁹⁰ although it seems clear that the animal is held in reverential dread by them.³⁹¹ The absence of the central feature of bear ceremonialism, i.e., treatment of the carcass preparatory to eating it, is corroborated by the statement of Castrén that it is very seldom that bear meat is eaten at all. It is believed, for example, that if a hunter eats bear flesh a bear will, at sometime or other, retaliate by eating him. The risk is not so great in the case of a man who is not a hunter, but even so there is another important taboo to be observed: viz., that fish and bear meat must never be eaten at the same meal, since this mixture would cause all of the fish to disappear from the rivers.³⁹² Furthermore, women are never allowed to eat a bear's flesh³⁹³ or at least the head of the animal.³⁹⁴

Finns

In Rune 46 of the *Kalevala* we find a poetic description of the slaughter of a bear by Väinämöinen and the triumphal return of the hunter to the people of Kaleva with the carcass.³⁹⁵ The bear

³⁹⁰ See Czaplicka (7) for a succinct statement regarding the location of the different groups.

³⁹¹ Czaplicka, *ibid.*, says, "with the exception of the Ostyak Samoyed, the Samoyedic tribes are much more given to ancestor and hero worship than to animal worship." She goes on to say that it is only the Ostyak Samoyed of the Ket who personify their ancestral god in animal form (i.e., as a bear). We may note here that it is also this group which is nearest the Ostyak, among whom bear ceremonialism is so important.

The "oath by the bear" is a strong indication of the reverential attitude of the Samoyed, see Rae, p. 146, and Castrén, (1), p. 263. The latter says it is "aus alter heiliger Scheu vor dem Bären," that the meat is not eaten. (2), p. 189, note; Middendorf, iv, p. 1443, refers to their fear of the polar bear and Erman, II, p. 54-5, writes, "The polar bear as the strongest of God's creatures, and that which seems to come nearest to the human being, is as much venerated by them, as his black congener by the Ostyaks." This author says they kill and eat it, and "show their respect for it in various ways" after it is dead. As no details are given we are obliged to leave the question of ceremonial treatment in doubt.

³⁹² Castrén, (2), p. 189, note, speaking of the Samoyed of Tomsk.

³⁹³ Jackson, (1) p. 404, 405. Bear meat was considered a delicacy, but was taboo to Women. . . . "She must not eat of that sacred beast, the bear. . . ."

³⁹⁴ Erman, II, p. 55.

³⁹⁵ Crawford's translation, II, p. 661 *seq.* The critical exegesis to which the *Kalevala* has been subjected since the time of Lönnrot makes it hazardous, if not im-

(Otso) was "joyfully and respectfully welcomed" and "the ceremonies befitting such an event were all observed with songs³⁹⁶ which have remained national, expressing regard and affection for the terrible yet valuable creature. The skin having been removed, a sumptuous, animated funeral banquet was held in his honour, and Väinämöinen sang the origin and story of this lord of the forest."³⁹⁷ From a comparative point of view there are quite a few items of special interest for us in the account as narrated in the epic.

It is said that the hunter comes home "singing o'er the hills and mountains, with his friend, the famous Light-foot, With the Honey-paw of Northland." Here we have the substitution phenomena, very naturally and significantly used by Lönnrot, and probably in its correct sociological setting. The people hear him and run out of their cabins inquiring what he has found. He replies,

The Illustrious is coming,
Pride and beauty of the forest,

possible, to assign the various aspects of Finnic culture which are reflected in it to any specific date. Yet it is clear that, in content, the oral literature out of which Lönnrot constructed it pictures, on the whole, a great many beliefs and practices which truly represent the pagan period. Hatt (pp. 126-7), while admitting the immense culture-historical value of the traditional songs upon which the *Kalevala* is based, refuses to accept Laufer's characterization [5], pp. 100-1) of it as "a true picture of the primeval cultural conditions in which the Finns lived prior to their Christianization." (A.D. 1151). However, Comparetti (p. 64) says, "of a truth, there is not to be found in the *Kalevala*, in any rune of any kind, mention of anything which is not, directly or indirectly, known to all the Finns of whatever district." It matters little, therefore, from our standpoint, whether the material used by Lönnrot dated from very different times and places or not. The fact that he actually collected songs clearly indicating bear veneration and ceremonialism places his data on a level with other ethnographical information, even though we have to depend upon its poetic redaction. Furthermore, the fact that he saw fit to include a section on the bear in the epic argues for the psychological importance which he must have attributed to it as representing an important series of customs in the lives of the people.

³⁹⁶ Georgi, I, p. 50, gives one of these which he says is sung at the death of the bear. It starts off, "Beasts of all forest beasts, revered, subdued and slain. . . ." The author comments upon the fact that "bears are held in great estimation among all the pagan nations of the North and Northeast," the people believing that this animal's soul, like a human being's, is immortal. This is the explanation, so he believes, of "all that superstitious grimace observable in the hunting of this animal."

³⁹⁷ The quotation is from Comparetti's epitome of the *Kalevala*, p. 111.

'Tis the Master comes among us,
 Covered with his friendly fur-robe.
 Welcome, Otso, welcome, Light-foot,
 Welcome, Loved-one from the glenwood!
 If the mountain guest is welcome,
 Open wide the gates of entry;
 If the bear is thought unworthy,
 Bar the door against the stranger.

The people then bid the animal welcome, using substitutive terms and telling the animal how they have wished and waited for its coming. In the subsequent passage Väinämöinen asks where the bear shall be taken and the reply is

To the dining-hall lead Otso,
 Greatest hero of the Northland,
 Famous Light-foot . . . etc.

.....

The bear is also told not to fear the "curly-head virgins" and that

Maidens hasten to their chambers
 When dear Otso joins their number
 When the hero comes among them.

The foregoing is very reminiscent of taboos for women in connection with the bear, not only among the Lapps, but in Siberia and North America.

The skinning of the bear is next described in quite hyperbolic fashion, and among other things the animal is told how much his "fur robe" is admired and that it will not be made into garments "to protect unworthy people."

The meat is then cooked and placed on the tables in readiness for the feast, whereupon Väinämöinen relates the supernatural origin of Otso, and how he acquired claws and teeth. This is followed by a description of how Tapio, the god of the forest and the master of the game animals, led Väinämöinen to the animal's den but that spear or bow and arrow were unnecessary to kill the bear because the beast lost its balance in a tree, tumbled, and met its death in that way.

The hunter then proceeds:

Now I take the eyes of Otso,
 Lest he lose the sense of seeing,
 Lest their former powers shall weaken;
 Though I take not all his members,
 Not alone must these be taken.

References to the ears, nose, tongue, and brain are made after a similar verbal pattern. Then the teeth and claws are referred to:

I will reckon him a hero,
That will count the teeth of Light-foot,
That will loosen Otso's fingers
From their settings firmly fastened.

Finding no others "with strength sufficient" the hero removes these himself. Reference is then made to taking the skull of the beast into the forest and hanging it on a high fir tree.³⁹⁸

In Feathermann there is to be found a very interesting description of a Finnic bear ceremony³⁹⁹ which, although brief, contains many points of considerable comparative significance. "The *Koowonpääliset* was a funeral festival which was celebrated in honour of the bear, who was kind enough to permit himself to be killed by the lucky hunter. From the whole neighborhood all the people, dressed in their best attire, assembled at an appointed place The head of the bear, which was suspended from a tree, attracted the eyes of all the guests, and words of praise and triumphant exultation gave expression to the glory of the fortunate hunter who had slain the mighty beast of the forest, and he was distinguished by a copper key which was attached to his weapons as a mark of honour. The stewed bear's meat was then brought out, and standing at the threshold of the dwelling the master of the house said: 'Let the children leave the hall; prevent the young girls from crowding round the door, for the noble one comes to visit the *tapa*, the celebrated one is introduced into the house.' The feasting then commenced, and was continued till late in the night. At the close of the banquet the Runic bards expatiated, in measured verses, on the homage that had been ren-

³⁹⁸ Cf. Comparetti, p. 111.

³⁹⁹ The work in which this account appears (pp. 421-2) is a secondary compilation of customs from various parts of the world with bibliographies at the end of each section, but no specific documentation. Unfortunately, I have been unable to locate the source of the author's description but this is probably due to the fact that most of the works cited in his Finnic bibliography have been inaccessible to me. But even though undocumented, the account given is important because it evidently represents (I infer this from internal evidence) the persistence into fairly recent times of the customary bear ceremony and feast among the Finns of which we have only the barest outlines in the Kalevala.

dered to the bear, the favored victim of the feast, urging him to report to his brethren of the forest the high consideration with which he had been treated, and following his example, they may permit themselves to be dispatched for the benefit of some adventurous huntsman."

A clue to the interpretation of the bear rites of the Finns is to be found, I think, in a conception which is not without fairly close parallels in the philosophy of nature to which other peoples under review adhere. It seems evident that the Finnic hunter believed that his success depended upon the good will of a supernatural controller of the game animals.⁴⁰⁰ In the case of the forest creatures this was *Tapio*,⁴⁰¹ with whom the bear was closely associated. In fact, it is said that the bear was nursed by *Tapio's* wife, *Hongatar*.⁴⁰² The detailed analysis of this problem belongs to the Finno-Ugrian specialist, but the mere statement of it suggests a motivation for the special attention paid to the bear.

Lapps

All of the earliest writers on the customs of the Lapps devote considerable attention to ceremonies connected with the bear. The distinctive features brought out by them have been summarized in the following account.⁴⁰³ As in the case of the Finns, the

⁴⁰⁰ Abercromby, I, p. 285 *seq.* The Votyak also entertain the same idea and call this being "forest uncle" or "forest man" and they make sacrifices to him. *Ibid.*, p. 161. The fact that they actually called the bear "forest uncle" makes the connection of the animal with this being clear enough. Cf. Buch, p. 139.

⁴⁰¹ In the glossary, Kalevala, II, p. 743, Tapio is defined as "the god of the forest." Cf. Abercromby, *op. cit.*

⁴⁰² Abercromby, I, p. 289.

⁴⁰³ The work of Scheffer is of fundamental importance as it was published in 1673 and gives a detailed compilation of still earlier observations. Leems and Regnard seem to lean upon Scheffer's book to some extent but give additional and confirmatory data. Fjellström is, perhaps, the most competent observer who published information in the eighteenth century but I have not had direct access to his work. Reuterskiöld draws so heavily, however, upon this account and is altogether so specific and discriminating as to sources that I feel satisfied that the major observations of Fjellström are extant in this secondary work. I have, therefore, indicated my use of Fjellström's data by placing his name in parentheses after Reuterskiöld's when the former is quoted regarding any point. The same practice is followed with respect to other authorities utilized by Reuterskiöld and Scheffer.

The special line of interest pursued by Reuterskiöld is the development of the

bear is apparently under the special protection of a forest deity,⁴⁰⁴ the woodland creatures being regarded as the latter's herds. Luck in hunting depended on his will and his favor was therefore very important.

When the carcass of a bear is dragged out of the animal's den it is customary for the hunters to beat it with birch sticks,⁴⁰⁵ dancing around and singing⁴⁰⁶ until they are almost exhausted. Another custom which follows the slaughter of the bear is described by Fjellström, but not referred to in the compilation of Scheffer.⁴⁰⁷ A birch sapling twisted into a ring is placed around the lower jaw of the beast and to this is tied the belt of the hunter who killed it. He then tugs at the jaw three times, singing in a

religious ideas and customs of the Lapps. As he believes the bear rites to belong to an early hunting stage of their history he finds these ceremonies to be a manifestation of the oldest phase of their religious evolution. At certain points, however, he links up customs connected with the bear with European practices and beliefs of wider provenience. Thus, for example, the whipping of the bear's carcass with birch twigs is associated, by the author, with the use of boughs in what are interpreted to represent, at a later period, magical rites for the growth of vegetation. I have not included any discussion of these points as they are entirely beyond the scope of this study, belonging more properly to the domain of the specialist in European ethnology.

I should like to acknowledge here my indebtedness to Professor A. J. Upvall, University of Pennsylvania, who was kind enough to translate for me the chapter in Reuterskiöld's work which especially deals with the Lappish bear customs.

⁴⁰⁴ Abercromby, I, p. 161. Scheffer, p. 95. The former calls this deity "*loeibolmai*," the latter, *Storjunkare*.

⁴⁰⁵ Scheffer (Samuel Rheen), p. 40. Cf. Reuterskiöld, p. 24. The latter says this custom has become proverbial.

⁴⁰⁶ Scheffer, p. 240. See Reuterskiöld's discussion of the so-called Lappish "bear songs" (p. 24). This writer points out that they are not songs in the usual sense of the term, i.e., with fixed words. They are subject to improvisation and are characteristically intoned, belonging to what he terms "joiking." This explains the variations noted in their content by different observers. Fjellström also drew attention to this point as well as to the use of special words in these ditties. The explanation given by this author was to the effect that the bear was considered such a sacred creature that in order not to meet with its disfavor they dared not mention the animal by name, or use the ordinary terms for its limbs, or even the utensils employed in eating the beast; hence, the employment of special terms.

⁴⁰⁷ It is, however, recorded for South Lappland (Ösele) by at least one observer writing before Fjellström. This was Petrus Thurenus (1724). See Reuterskiöld, p. 25. Local differences in procedure must, of course, have existed and this may perhaps explain why Scheffer does not refer to the custom. Fjellström says that in his time bear customs were not characteristic of the southernmost Lapps (Reuterskiöld, p. 19).

peculiar intonation that he is the conqueror. The ring is then taken off and the hunter, carrying it back to camp with him, announces his arrival by pounding three times on the door of his dwelling and crying out, if the bear is male, "sacred man," or if a female, "sacred virgin." Fjellstrom says this practice is not intended to announce the killing of the beast but to magically transfer the power and strength of the dead bear to the hunter's household. Sometimes a similar purpose is accomplished by each hunter taking a bit of the blood of the animal and smearing it on the entrance posts of his hut. In cases where the ring is used, the successful hunter presents it to his wife who wraps it up in a piece of cloth and keeps it until the end of the bear feast. At this time a part of a brass chain is tied to it as well as to the animal's tail. The men then bury the ring with the bones of the bear, but the chain is frequently removed before this is done and hung on a drum to make the latter "powerful."

After pulling at the ring above described, it was sometimes customary for the slayer of the bear to point his spear three times at the animal. This was for the purpose of obtaining more power for the weapon in future hunts.

Another custom observed after the killing of a bear, was for the hunters to push their ski across the carcass as a sign of their success in worsting it. If they failed to do this they feared that in the next hunt a bear would run across their ski and upset them.⁴⁰⁸

The animal is then covered over with spruce boughs and left in the woods until the following day, even if the carcass is within a short distance of their camp.⁴⁰⁹ In the oldest accounts it is stated that the bear was eaten near the spot where killed,⁴¹⁰ but even by Fjellström's time (1755) it is said that a bear was rarely cooked and eaten in the woods, unless it was an unusually long distance from the camp. The animal was conveyed to a Lappish

⁴⁰⁸ Reuterskiöld (Fjellström p. 29).

⁴⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴¹⁰ Scheffer, e.g., writes (p. 241) that "it is their custom to boil the Bear's Flesh immediately near the same Place where they have killed him, unless for want of wood and other necessities, they are forced to carry him to some more convenient Place, where they erect a Hut, for that purpose. . . ." Cf. Reuterskiöld, p. 30.

settlement by placing the carcass on a sledge drawn by a reindeer.⁴¹¹ They sing to the bear along the way, petitioning the beast not to raise "tempests or do any other harm to those who had been concerned in the slaughter,"⁴¹² or, according to another writer, "they give thanks to God the Creator of wild Beasts for their Use; and for having endowed them with sufficient Force and Courage, to overcome so strong and fierce a creature."⁴¹³

As they approach the camp the hunters sing another song in which a desire is expressed to have their wives chew elder bark and spit the juice in their faces. As they enter their respective dwellings (on this occasion it is compulsory for the man to come in through the small rear door which has a specialized connection with game and hunting),⁴¹⁴ the women proceed to carry out this unique rite.⁴¹⁵ After this the immediate preparations for the feast commence.

⁴¹¹ This animal, says Scheffer (Rheen), p. 241, is not supposed to be driven by a woman for a year and according to an anonymous author who is quoted, the men are also forbidden its use during the same period. Cf. Pinkerton (Regnard), 1, p. 194.

⁴¹² Scheffer (p. 240) comments here: "This seems to be intended by way of derision, in the same manner as they thank the Bear for his coming thither . . . ; unless, we suppose, they entertain a certain Superstition that the killing of these wild Beasts proves sometimes ominous to the Hunters, which indeed is the Opinion of some among them to this day."

The association of the bear with the weather is further elucidated in the following passage, p. 150. "When the Laplanders pretend to cause an alteration of the excessive cold, they take a Bear's Skin, which they hang up all Night abroad. The first thing the Laplander does after he rises out of his Bed, is to whip the said Skin for a considerable time with Rods, by which means they pretend to moderate the excessive cold of the Season; tho' I am apt to believe that they also make use of certain words, which they mutter betwixt their teeth." Cf. Reuterskiöld's quotation from Lundius, p. 27.

⁴¹³ Scheffer (Rheen), p. 240.

⁴¹⁴ See Scheffer, p. 209, where a diagrammatic arrangement of a Lappish dwelling is to be found; also p. 206 ff. for a discussion of the common door and the smaller opening in the rear of the hut. Suffice it here to remark that the rear door was taboo to women and through it the products of hunting, fishing, and fowling were always brought in. Wexovious speaks of it as a "window," but all of the other early writers on the Lapps term it a "door," Cf. Rheen on this subject (*ibid.*, p. 246).

⁴¹⁵ See *ibid.*, p. 241-1. The author states that the women are accustomed to use elder-bark juice for the purpose of dyeing their utensils. He attempts what appears to be a rationalization of the custom by saying that "they spit it in their husbands' Faces, by reason of its resemblance to the Bear's blood, whom they would not seem

The Lapp men cook⁴¹⁶ the bear meat in a specially erected hut⁴¹⁷ to which the women are not admitted. Leems says that they did not enter it "until they had at first stripped off their cloaths, considering it as impious to enter it in the cloaths in which they had killed the bear. The males stayed three days here, but the women during that time inhabited the cot" (regular dwelling).⁴¹⁸ It was forbidden at this time to use the ordinary word for "cook," a circumlocutory term being proper instead.⁴¹⁹ After entering the hut the men sang "songs of joy and thanks to the animal that they have been allowed to return in safety."⁴²⁰

The animal is placed in a supine position and a bark funnel is sometimes placed in its mouth.⁴²¹ This funnel is filled with chewed alder bark and before the beast is skinned some of the masticated bark is squirted along the animal's body and some put into its rectum. The knives and utensils to be used in eating the

to have killed, without great Danger and Trouble." Rheen says that only the wife of the leader of the hunt spits in her husband's face. Scheffer adds another curious detail, remarking that the women look through a Brass Ring, "as if they were aiming at some certain mark, as we do with our Guns," when they do this spitting.

⁴¹⁶ The oldest writers seem all agreed that among the Laps it was not only customary for the men to provide the game but also to cook it. Scheffer, e.g., says (p. 256), "all their Victuals are dressed by the men and not by the women. It is the Men's Busines to provide, boil and dress their Victuals." Pinkerton (Regnard), 1, p. 188, states that the women only cooked when the men were absent; Linnaeus writes, "every kind of fish or meat is cooked by the men" (1, p. 318). See also pp. 132, 340; cf. Acerbi, II, p. 189.

⁴¹⁷ It is called *qwertek* (Reuterskiöld [Fjellström], p. 30) and the custom was still in force in this observer's time. Scheffer also refers to this hut (p. 241), as does Regnard (Pinkerton, 1, p. 194), who says, "They construct a hut for the express purpose of dressing the bear which is employed in no other manner." One may perhaps legitimately speculate whether the practice of erecting such a hut can be correlated with cooking and eating the bear in camp. The exclusion of the women suggests the need for it there, but if the meat were prepared near the place where the animal was killed in the woods, as the older accounts indicate, only males would be present anyway.

⁴¹⁸ Pinkerton, 1, p. 485. Sexual continence during the period of the bear feast was imposed upon all the men who had participated in the hunt, the leader having to obey this restriction for two days longer than the rest. Scheffer, pp. 242-3.

⁴¹⁹ Pinkerton (Leems), 1, p. 485. "*guordestam*" was substituted for "*Vuoshjan*."

⁴²⁰ Pinkerton (Regnard), 1, p. 194.

⁴²¹ Reuterskiöld, p. 31 (Fjellström). This funnel is not mentioned by the earlier writers. According to Fjellström it is put under the bear's nose when the animal's bones are interred.

bear are adorned with brass rings and chains and placed on the carcass, some of them on the head. The slayer of the bear does the flaying. The hairless skin of the nose is cut off first and the hunter fastens this to his own face and ears and then proceeds with the skinning. The skin of the head is never removed. As soon as a large enough opening is made the blood is bailed out with cups. It is then mixed with a little fat, boiled and drunk by the men as a "toast" to the bear before any of the meat is touched.⁴²² It is customary for the meat to be cut up in such a way that none of the bones of the animal are broken.⁴²³ The throat and the intestines are left connected with the head until the remainder of the flesh is boiled. When part of the meat is boiled, the liver is taken out, spitted and roasted at the fire.⁴²⁴ While the flesh, fat, and blood are boiling⁴²⁵ the hunters, says Scheffer, "sit round the Hearth, every one in his proper place." The first place on the right belongs to the man who located the bear's den or the leader of the hunting party, the next person to him being the "shaman" (or drum beater), and next to the latter sits the hunter who "first encountered" the animal. On the left side sits the man who cut the wood with which the fire was built, next to him the hunter who brought the water in which the flesh was to be boiled, and so on.⁴²⁶

Although both men and women alike ate the slaughtered bear's meat they did not sit down at a "common board"⁴²⁷ and

⁴²² Reuterskiöld, p. 31. They imitate the gurgling and grunting sounds of the beast.

⁴²³ This applies to other game as well. See *ibid.*, p. 32.

⁴²⁴ Pinkerton (Leems), 1, p. 463, calls this a "host or kind of sacrifice" called "vuodno-baffem." Cf. Acerbi, II, p. 302, who terms it a "burnt-offering."

⁴²⁵ Scheffer says (p. 243) that this is done in brass kettles and that the fat is skimmed off with "wooden vessels" on which are fastened "as many Brass Plates, as they have killed Bears." The latter is good corroborative evidence of the extreme pride with which bear killing is endowed. Fjellström says it was regarded as unlucky if the kettle boiled over and any liquid fell into the fire. If the stew boiled too hard it was thought to be a sign that the women were doing something improper and someone was dispatched to see what they were up to (p. 32). If everything was normal, a song would some times be sung to make the kettle simmer down.

⁴²⁶ Fjellström says that the Lapps he knew did not do this (p. 32).

⁴²⁷ Scheffer (p. 242) speaks of a preliminary feast in which men and women jointly participated, held in one of the regular dwellings (of the leader?) which follows

different portions of the animal were the prerogative of each sex.⁴²⁸ It is the duty of the "shaman" to apportion the men their share, whereas the "leader" assigns the women their customary portion, two men being specially delegated to carry it to them. They sing as they go, the sense being, "Here come the men out of Sweden, Poland, England and France." The women answer with, "You men who are come from Sweden, Poland, England and France, we will tye red strings round your legs," which they proceed to do.⁴²⁹ The men must pass the meat into the dwelling through some other opening than the regular doorway.⁴³⁰ All of the meat must be eaten the same day and care taken that nothing is left.⁴³¹

All of the bones of the bear are preserved intact and after the feast they are interred, care being taken to arrange them in their natural relationships.⁴³²

the return of the hunters and precedes the retirement of the men to the hut where the bear is cooked. No bear meat is eaten at this repast.

⁴²⁸ Scheffer (p. 243) says that the women were not allowed to eat any of the hind part of the bear, the forequarters being their special share. Cf. Leems (Pinkerton, 1, p. 485); Regnard (*ibid.*), p. 184; Reuterskiöld (Lundius), p. 33. Scheffer records that the same practice applies in the case of hares, birds, and wild reindeer (p. 243). Fjellström observed the reverse and Thurenus says the women's share consists of anything behind the shoulder blades (p. 33). The three or four extreme vertebrae in the hind quarters belong to oldest men. The heart is taboo to women, as is the case with other animals, too. The men eat it to acquire strength and courage. Forbus (Reuterskiöld, p. 34) says the women never touched the meat but ate it on a stick. Thurenus maintains that all those who did not participate in killing the bear were compelled to do this.

⁴²⁹ Scheffer, p. 244.

⁴³⁰ See section on treatment of the carcass, note. Leems (p. 485) in describing this custom, seems considerably more realistic in respect to the so-called "door" in the rear of the dwelling, which is simply referred to as such by the other observers already quoted. Speaking of the portion of the meat assigned to the women, he writes, "it should not be given them through the usual door, but put in *through a rent made in the covering of the cot*, in the place where the pots and kettles were put. . . ." (Italics mine.) Regnard (Pinkerton, 1, p. 194) writes that the meat is thrown in "at the hole through which the smoke issues, in order that it may appear to have been sent and descended from Heaven. They do the same, when they return from the chase of other animals."

⁴³¹ Reuterskiöld, p. 32. Fjellström says that salt was never used with bear meat. (p. 34). Cf. Saghalin Ainu and Gilyak.

⁴³² See Reuterskiöld, p. 34. Cf. Pinkerton (Leems), 1, p. 885. Scheffer writes (p. 244), "after the men and women have eaten all the Flesh, they gather up the Bones, but don't break them for the Marrow's sake, as they do with those of some other

A final ceremony referred to by several of the earlier writers is performed by the women. The skin of the bear is hung up and the women, blindfolded, shoot at it with bows and arrows. The husband of the woman who first hits the skin will be the next man to kill a bear.⁴³³

Upon returning to their own dwellings each man takes hold of the chain on which the kettle hangs and after dancing three times around the hearth runs out through the common door of the hut. The women sing a song and throw ashes on the men.⁴³⁴

Amur-Gulf of Tartary Region

The Gilyak Bear Festival.—The Gilyak are to be distinguished from other Siberian tribes which celebrate periodic bear festivals in that the ceremony, while similar in some of its general objective features to the feasts found elsewhere, has a unique socio-psychological context; that is to say, it has become integrated with the kinship groupings of these people to a remarkable degree. It will only be necessary here to call attention to this aspect of it in summary form.

The tribe is organized in father sibs,⁴³⁵ called *khal*,⁴³⁶ whose members from the native viewpoint are said to characteristically share a common name,⁴³⁷ common fathers-in-law and conversely

beasts, but bury them whole. . . .” According to one author, S. Nils (Reuterskiöld p. 34) the vertebrae are threaded in natural order upon a sapling, with the skull on top. A log is rolled over the remains so that dogs and other animals cannot touch or carry them away.

⁴³³ Scheffer, p. 244. The women sing “We will shoot him who is come from Sweden, Poland, England, and France.” One author quoted by Scheffer says that the liver of the bear is hung up and shot at, with the same belief. The woman who hits the skin is sometimes required to work as many crosses of tin wire covered with sinews as there have been bears killed. The hunters wear these about their necks for three days. The reindeer which drew the sledge on which the bear was brought from the woods is also adorned with one of these crosses.

⁴³⁴ Scheffer, op. cit.

⁴³⁵ Sternberg, *The Gilyak* (MS) quoted by Goldenweiser (1), p. 235.

⁴³⁶ Czaplicka (5), p. 43, literally “foot-sack” (used in traveling).

⁴³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 49. It is interesting to note that these clan-names “are generally the names of localities where the clans formerly lived. Here and there we find names of animals as the origin of clan names, but this occurs chiefly where there is a Tungus admixture.”

sons-in-law;⁴³⁸ a common fire;⁴³⁹ common mountain, sea, sky, and earth "men";⁴⁴⁰ a common "devil";⁴⁴¹ *thusind* (right to compensation for offences);⁴⁴² common "sin,"⁴⁴³ and a common bear.⁴⁴⁴ Of these, the supernatural protectors of the kinship groups, the "Gentilgötter,"⁴⁴⁵ or mountain, sea, sky, and earth "men," require a few words of explanation in order to understand the rôle played by the bear in Gilyak thought and in the bear festival. If we stop for a moment to consider briefly the philosophy of nature to which they adhere, we shall find it gives us the necessary key.

To the Gilyak mind the natural features of the earth and heavens and members of the animal kingdom all have their spiritual "owners" or "masters"; their visible aspect is merely an appearance. Furthermore, being a hunting and fishing folk, they strive to maintain an especially close rapport between themselves and the "owners" of the forest, mountains, and sea, because these supernatural beings are believed to control the stock of game and fish on which their livelihood depends.⁴⁴⁶ Another peculiarity of their beliefs is the notion that the souls of deceased Gilyak "who die by drowning, are killed by wild animals, or those who are beloved by the 'owners' of the mountain, sea, or earth" become associated with these "owners" after death.⁴⁴⁷ This is what happens, for example, when a Gilyak is killed by a bear.⁴⁴⁸

⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 43-4. This is due to marriage regulations connected with degrees of relationship and secondarily to the exogamous character of the sibs resulting therefrom. See Goldenweiser (1), pp. 235-6, who writes these terms *axmalk* and *ymgi* respectively, Czaplicka (5), p. 43, as *ahmalk* and *ymgi*.

⁴³⁹ Czaplicka (5), pp. 44-5.

⁴⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁴⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 46; "a common enemy in the person of a deceased clansman or a slain enemy."

⁴⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 40-48.

⁴⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 49. Taboos common to sib mates.

⁴⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 45-46.

⁴⁴⁵ Sternberg (1), p. 257-259; Czaplicka [5], p. 272, "clan-gods."

⁴⁴⁶ Sternberg (1), pp. 244-248, 252-3.

⁴⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 257-8 (quotation from Czaplicka (5), p. 45).

⁴⁴⁸ The statement of Lansdell (II p. 232, note), that to be killed by a bear is a happy death for a Gilyak, is readily understood when their concept of the "Gentilgötter" is called to mind. Von Schrenck's statement, III, p. 696, that the soul of a person killed by a bear "goes to the forest and becomes transformed into a bear" is

His soul becomes a "little owner" and a member of the transcendental sib of the "'owners' of bears."⁴⁴⁹ These deceased Gilyak become the special supernatural protectors of their living sib mates and thus link up the supernatural realm with the mundane sphere in the closest bonds of fellowship.⁴⁵⁰ Homage is rendered by the living Gilyak to the supernatural "owners,"⁴⁵¹ as well as to their deceased sib mates⁴⁵² who are associated with them, by means of sacrifices and festivals which are held in their honor. The bear festival is one of the most important of these.⁴⁵³

The Gilyak look upon the bear as an honored emissary from the supernatural realm of the "owners" referred to.⁴⁵⁴ After it is killed in one of their periodic ceremonies they believe that its soul returns again to the supernatural world.⁴⁵⁵ It is a messenger, "der Überbringer aller möglichen Gaben an 'den Herrn des Berges,' von dem das Wohlergehen des Giljaken abhängt."⁴⁵⁶

also entirely comprehensible in terms of Gilyak philosophy. Cf. Sternberg, p. 258. Light is also thrown upon the motivation of the special mortuary treatment of persons killed by bears (see Czaplicka [5], p. 153). Instead of the usual cremation, the body is "placed in a shed called *chyr-nykhh*, near the place of the accident and food is brought thither several times."

⁴⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 458.

⁴⁵⁰ As Sternberg points out (p. 257), these "Gentilgötter" are not supernatural mythical beings "wie bei den Griechen und Römern, sondern seine eigenen Gentilgenossen, welche infolge verschiedener Ursachen in die Gens dieses oder jenes Gottes. . . . 'Herrn' Eintritt fanden." Again (p. 258), "Es sind keine mythischen Götter. . . . sondern reale Persönlichkeiten, die in der Vorstellung ihrer Verehrer machtvoll leben." Their life is conceived to parallel that of the Gilyak themselves.

⁴⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 254.

⁴⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 257, 259. That the Gilyak usually have in mind their "sib-gods" in many of their offerings, rather than the "owners" themselves is indicated by the following remarks of Sternberg, pp. 458-9. "In Wirklichkeit erhält also jede Gens ihre Beute nicht unmittelbar vom 'Herrn des Berges,' sondern gerade von ihrem Gentilgott, welcher sich speziell im Jagdgebiete seiner Gens ansiedelt. Daher werden auch die durch den Bären übersandten Geschenke eigentlich nicht direkt an den allerhöchsten 'Herrn,' sondern an den nächsten 'Herrn des Berges'—den Gentilgenossen dirigiert."

⁴⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 459.

⁴⁵⁴ They say, e.g., that "Der Bär ist der Hund des Herrn des Berges." P. 456, also p. 253.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 456-7.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 458. Even Hawes, though a casual observer, boils down the religious motive of the festival to "the sending of a messenger to the great lord of the mountains,

The slaughter of the animal is thus not in any sense a sacrifice but only the occasion for making offerings to the "owners."⁴⁵⁷ In return, the latter, or more accurately, perhaps, the transcendental protectors (Gentilgötter) of each sib, secure for their mundane kinsmen a ready supply of game.⁴⁵⁸

Sternberg believes that since the "owners" and the "Gentilgötter" associated with them appear to man only in an animal form, we have here a kind of incipient "totemism." But, because there are so few sibs in which one or more members have not been killed in combat with a bear or drowned in the sea or river, he maintains that any exclusive association of an animal as the supernatural protector of any particular sib could not come about. This made it impossible for full-fledged totemism to develop.⁴⁵⁹

From the Gilyak standpoint we can now appreciate why it is that the bear, of all animals, is looked upon with such special veneration⁴⁶⁰ and we can understand more clearly the significance of the bear festival. In fact, we may say that the attitudes and practices associated with this powerful creature focus for us the most typical aspects of Gilyak socio-religious life. From the religious angle, for instance, it is necessary "to venerate the slain bear, for he may belong to the fraternity of the 'owners of the

Pal ni vookh" (p. 201). "The 'owner' spirit of the mountain, and the mountain itself, is named Pal . . ." writes Czaplicka (5), p. 271, quoting Sternberg's "The Gilyak" (in Russian).

⁴⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 457. In the bear festival the offerings are dogs, fish, tobacco, arrows, etc.

⁴⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 254. The principle of reciprocity is important in their ideology. "Das Prinzip des Opfers bildet—der Tausch, und deshalb darf dem Gott des Meeres kein Fisch, dem Gott des Urwalds kein Fleisch von Tieren dargebracht werden."

⁴⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 258-9 Cf. Goldenweiser's comments in relation to the question of totemic origins, p. 259.

⁴⁶⁰ Sternberg (1), p. 250; Von Schrenck, III, p. 696; Seeland, p. 797, says "he is a sacred animal but not a deity."

Hawes, p. 168, e.g., says "the *ch'uff*, as they call the bear on Saghalin plays the greatest rôle in the animal world. He is regarded with peculiar sentiments. . . ."

Other less critical observers, impressed with the Gilyak attitude toward the bear have wrongly categorized their beliefs and customs as "worship," e.g., Niemojowski, 1, p. 49. "In addition to the white and black gods, they worship several animals, and more especially the bear, seeing in it the embodiment of power, strength and fearlessness; cf. Tronson, p. 135; Notes on the River Amur, etc., p. 396; Lansdell, II, p. 233.

mountain,' or be the incarnation of some remote fellow clansman's spirit, which had been received into that fraternity. Again, the bear is regarded as the intermediary between mortals and the 'owner of the mountain,' so that sacrifices may be sent by the bear to that spirit, an important matter, for this 'owner' has power over all animals. This is the reason why the bear festival plays such an important part in the life of the clan, and why, although clansmen from other groups may be present at the festival, the organization and management of the feast are in the hands of the clansmen, only sons-in-law, besides, being allowed to assist in this way."⁴⁶¹ "Socially, the bear festival is equally important. It affords an opportunity for widely separated members of the clan to meet and share various social pleasures, the more so as the ceremonies are usually followed by games and sports of different kinds. Besides, it gives scope for the formation of friendships with other clans."⁴⁶²

We may now turn to the bear festival itself which is a periodic affair held in the winter.⁴⁶³ The animals killed upon this occasion are those which usually have been caught in the forest⁴⁶⁴ as cubs and brought back to the village, where they are confined in cages

⁴⁶¹ Czaplicka (5), p. 46.

⁴⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 46. Sternberg (1), p. 260, says that the bear feast plays a similar rôle in the social economy of the Gilyak to that of the Olympic games among the Greeks.

⁴⁶³ Sternberg (1), p. 260, gives the native name for it as *Tschchyf-l'échchernd*. At least one of these celebrations, he says, takes place every year in one Gilyak village or another, usually in memory of a deceased sib-mate (Gentilgenossen). Von Schrenck writes (p. 699) that the festival is generally held in December but sometimes in January or February. It cannot fall later than April first, as preparations are by this time under way for the annual migration to summer quarters. The owner of the bear (or bears) to be used in the feast, who also must act as host, decides upon the specific date, although a shaman may sometimes be consulted. Lansdell, II, p. 232 (note), gives January as the usual time of the festival as does Deniker (Seeland), p. 307. Sternberg says (p. 262) February. Cf. Labbé, p. 261, for the Gilyak of Saghalin and Hawes, p. 196.

⁴⁶⁴ Sternberg (1), p. 260; Von Schrenck, p. 697; Deniker (Seeland), p. 307; Lansdell, II, p. 231. Von Schrenck and Seeland refer to the practice (no doubt modern) of purchasing bears to be used in the ceremonies from the Saghalin natives. But, caught or purchased, the arrival of a new live bear in the village is itself an occasion for rejoicing, music, etc. See the accounts *op. cit.* for details as to how the cubs are obtained and their reception.

for two or three years.⁴⁶⁵ The animal is treated as an honored guest during the period of its captivity. It is well fed, its cage is cleaned regularly, and periodically it is taken for a stroll and a bath, an event, indeed, which is immensely enjoyed by the whole village, young and old alike gathering around the animal on its peregrinations.⁴⁶⁶

In preparation for the bear festival great quantities of food and drink must be made ready for the many guests who will assemble, as the occasion would not be complete without these material stimulants to jollification. Although the owner of the bear, as the customary director of the festival, must shoulder a great deal of the expense connected with it, his sib mates cooperate with such remarkable zeal that actually the burden is fairly well distributed over this kin group as a whole.⁴⁶⁷ A further

⁴⁶⁵ Sternberg (1), p. 260; Deniker (Seeland), p. 308. The practice of keeping bears in captivity is evidently a very old custom. See Von Schrenck's remarks (p. 698). A misinterpretation of it, as early as the seventeenth century, gave rise to the tale that the Gilyak kept tame bears and used them for various types of domestic service. Even the most casual sojourners in this region have reported the bear cages, e.g., Lansdell, II, p. 231; Tronson, p. 135; Notes on the Amur, p. 396. The time of confinement, of course, depends upon the age of the bear; some may be kept only a few months, if nearly full grown, whereas cubs are kept until maturity. (Von Schrenck, p. 699). The Gilyak of Saghalin also encage bears (Labbé, p. 261; Hawes, pp. 162, 195, illus. opposite 196).

⁴⁶⁶ Sternberg (1), pp. 260-1. Hawes, p. 196 (Saghalin Gilyak). Von Schrenck (p. 698) describes the process of removing the bear from its cage in some detail. The animal is held in leash, of course, by means of a special kind of "harness."

The feeding of the bear devolves, according to Sternberg, not upon the owner alone but upon the sib mates of this individual, each family taking its turn on "bear service." Von Schrenck, on the other hand, speaks of the bear as belonging to the whole village community (Dorfgenossenschaft) the members of which are jointly responsible for the animal's care. Valuable as are the observations of the latter observer, Sternberg's detailed investigation of the social organization of these people has undoubtedly demonstrated the correctness of his view. The communal spirit of the bear festival and its preliminaries, however, was clearly sensed by Von Schrenck. Even among the sibless Ainu it is an affair in which a group of individuals feel a common responsibility. The duties of the host in both cases function within this group. Von Schrenck figures the long spoon (*nichyr*) used in feeding the bear (plate 21, no. 2). He never heard of Gilyak women suckling bear cubs (p. 736), nor is this practice reported by later authorities.

⁴⁶⁷ Sternberg (pp. 261-2). This observer comments: "Here is exhibited the admirable (bewunderungswürdige) sib organization of the Gilyak which, in its har-

preliminary activity, of quite another kind, is the preparation of the arena where the bear is to meet its death.⁴⁶⁸

Finally, on the evening before the festival proper⁴⁶⁹ begins, "*inao*" are manufactured. They are of different sizes and vary somewhat in form. Each kind is manufactured in pairs and represents a male and female. They are tied both on the tips of the poles of the arena and below.⁴⁷⁰ In function they seem to partake both of the nature of "mediators," between the Gilyak and the "owners" of the forest, etc. and talismans.⁴⁷¹

The actual beginning of the festival itself is best characterized by the removal of the bear from its cage for the last time and the custom of leading it about from house to house. As Von Schrenck says,⁴⁷² this seems to furnish the chief amusement of the affair prior to the slaughter of the beast. These perambulations are apparently for the purpose of indicating to the animal the honor and esteem in which it is held in every dwelling⁴⁷³ where

monious combination of social solidarity and individual freedom, is so astonishing." Cf. Von Schrenck, p. 697, who emphasizes a trifle more strongly the necessary opulence of the host.

⁴⁶⁸ In the middle of a well stamped down place in the snow there is erected a pair of posts (if more than one animal is to be killed there is a pair for each) between which the bear will be tied. A long, narrow alley of trees is next constructed (out of fir and willow) leading up to this place. Each pair of trees in this alley is considered to be male and female. Sternberg (1), p. 262. Cf. Von Schrenck, p. 706; Hawes, p. 198.

⁴⁶⁹ This day is termed *nau-wachn-ku*, i.e., the day of the preparation of *inao*. Sternberg, *op. cit.*, p. 262. Von Schrenck, p. 704, says that women and girls are not permitted to shave them.

⁴⁷⁰ Von Schrenck refers to their use in other ways. See, e.g., plate XI (description p. 700), where they are suspended above the roof of the house where the festival was held from a string attached to two poles made of fir trees erected at each end of the dwelling. A stick stuck up in the snow near the house door also carried one.

⁴⁷¹ Sternberg (1), p. 262. As the significance and use of these religious objects has an application far wider than the bear festival we have not considered it necessary to go into further detail. Sternberg (2), while discussing their functions among the Ainu, frequently refers to Gilyak analogies. See also his remarks (1), p. 246. In his opinion the *inao* cult has been borrowed from the Ainu. See Czaplicka (5), p. 271, note 4.

⁴⁷² p. 702.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 703; Lansdell, II, p. 232, (note); cf. also Deniker (Seeland), pp. 307, 308. This custom is not emphasized in Sternberg's general account, but in the village in which Von Schrenck witnessed the ceremonies it occupied the major part of several days. It seemed, he says, that they could not get enough of it. At this ceremony there

specially prepared victuals await it. As the bear is led about it is teased from every side in a seeming attempt to make the animal lose its temper.⁴⁷⁴ It is considered a notable feat for the host to cautiously slip up to the bear, seize its head and kiss it farewell and then jump quickly aside. A stroke from the beast's paw under such circumstances, even though it may rip open one's shoulder or head, is considered to be a mark of special favor. The bear is usually led down to the river at some point in one of the promenades and around the hole in the ice from which water is secured.⁴⁷⁵ This is to ensure an abundance of fish for each family.⁴⁷⁶

Before the bear is killed it is led around the host's house three times and finally into it. Previously, however, everyone—men, women, children, (and dogs)—must leave the dwelling and when the bear appears only the oldest men of the sib stand at the entrance. As the bear is led into the house it is teased with a long pole to the end of which are attached fir branches.⁴⁷⁷ At the same time soft words are spoken to the creature. The bear is then led to an especially prepared place and tied between two stakes which are decorated with *inao*. The pole with which the beast is teased is fastened to the middle of the hearth in such a way that the tip of it passes up the smoke hole and protrudes above the house top. The bear is now left to itself as the people crowd back into the house and begin to lose themselves in unrestrained frivolity.⁴⁷⁸

were three bears to be killed and as they were led about and in and out of the houses, their growls seemed as delightful to the Gilyak as music to our ears. They were handled with remarkable dexterity and every move the animals made was noted and discussed. The author remarks that the usually taciturn Gilyak became so vivacious as to be almost unrecognizable (p. 705). For Von Schrenck's detailed description, see pp. 702-8

⁴⁷⁴ Sternberg (1), p. 264.

⁴⁷⁵ Von Schrenck (p. 708) refers to leading the animal around the village and down on the river in the moonlight. See pl. XLVIII; Lansdell, II, p. 232 (note), says they try to make the bear drink out of a hole in the ice.

⁴⁷⁶ Deniker (Seeland), p. 308.

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. Hawes' account of the Saghalin Gilyak, p. 197.

⁴⁷⁸ Sternberg (1), pp. 264-5. For a description of the more or less extraneous social activities which accompany a bear festival Von Schrenck is the best source. See. pl. XI, and pp. 701, 706-7-8, 719, for his description of games, dog racing, etc. One can gain some comprehension of the manner in which these fit into the proceeding as a whole if it is remembered that the ritualistic customs connected with the bear itself are only the prerogative of a few individuals. These do not, after all, occupy a

In the meantime, the *Narch-en*⁴⁷⁹ are engaged in the serious business of preparing the bow and arrow which is to send the animal upon its long journey. When all is ready the bear is fed for the last time by the host, or the oldest man of the sib celebrating the festival. The animal is requested to present "a good place" at which to be shot and is bidden *adieu* as follows: "Farewell, I feed you for the last time; go directly to your 'owner.' May you be able to gain your master's affection." The animal is then led to the arena, accompanied by all of the males present at the feast, the women being forbidden to attend this event.⁴⁸⁰ The headman of the sib, or the owner of the bear, walks first, carrying a little kettle and axe in his hands; the oldest of the *Narch-en*, also with kettle and axe,⁴⁸¹ follows after, and then come the remainder of the *Narch-en* and the other guests. After a preliminary trial shooting at a target with bows and arrows,⁴⁸² a deep silence falls on the crowd as the *Narch-en* selected as the executioner takes his weapon in hand. He waits until the bear turns itself in such a way that an

great space of time and the interludes are socially enjoyed by those upon whom none of the serious responsibility falls. Some of these games are undoubtedly played in honor of the bear as well as for amusement. See Von Schrenck's remarks, p. 701. It may also be noted that this characteristic combination of seriousness and frivolity distinguishes Gilyak bear ceremonialism from that of any of the other peoples which venerate the animal. This is the point which Labbé (p. 261) had in mind, perhaps, when he wrote that the periodic ceremony of the Saghalin Gilyak had much less religious significance than that of the Ainu and that the former people treated the animal with much more familiarity.

⁴⁷⁹ This term refers to the especially honored guests of the festival. They are the representatives of the sibs into which the daughters of the host (the owner of the bear) and other women of this sib have married. Frequently, the rôle of *Narch-en* thus falls upon a son-in-law of the host. One of these *Narch-en* is chosen by the others to kill the bear and as a group they receive the largest portion of the flesh. Members of as many as ten sibs may take part in one of these festivals. Sternberg (1), p. 263.

⁴⁸⁰ Or else the bear might not present a "good place." *Ibid.*, p. 265.

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 266. These are called *nitsch*, which means "yours and mine" (*meins-deins*). These *nitsch* are exchanged after the festival by the host and the oldest *Narch-en* as a sign of eternal fellowship.

⁴⁸² Sternberg (p. 266) thinks that what is now a more or less perfunctory formality represents a survival of an ancient shooting match, characteristic of the period when the bow was an important weapon among the Gilyak. In Saghalin (Hawes, p. 198) blunt arrows were shot at the bear preliminary to despatching it. This parallels the Ainu custom.

arrow can be sent directly into the heart.⁴⁸³ Several men usually rush upon the animal immediately after it is hit, in order to throttle the bear and thereby hasten its death.⁴⁸⁴

In Hawes' account of a Gilyak bear festival on Saghalin he says that sometimes a shaman took part in the ceremonies, although this custom seemed to be on the decline. Just before the animal was shot this individual "with a pine-twig in his hand amid the deep silence of the spectators, goes close to the bear and whispers in its ear:

You have eaten many berries,
You have caught many fish,
You have frightened many people;
Your ancestors and your comrades have 'broken' many Gilyaks:
Therefore you must die for it.
But your 'host' has fed you three whole years,
Not stinting the delicious *yukola* (dried fish),
He has given you the best water,
He has taken you for walks,
He has bathed you thrice a day in the 'summer year,'
And three 'winter years' you have lived in a nice warm lodging,
He, your host, will not kill you:
Therefore you must not complain about him to the Great
Lord of the mountains."⁴⁸⁵

As no other observer mentions the participation of a shaman in a Gilyak festival, this variant feature of the Saghalin group, if correct, is of considerable interest. The content of the speech reported is certainly consistent with Gilyak notions, but at the same time its general pattern savors very strongly of Ainu speeches. My guess would be that we have here, perhaps, an indication of

⁴⁸³ Sometimes the animal is disinclined to move and then some one will irritate it. The opinion is held that if the bear can be made angry at this time it will lighten the pain of its wound. Sternberg, p. 266. Cf. Hawes' description of the shooting of the bear on Saghalin, p. 200.

⁴⁸⁴ The shot generally proves fatal, however. *Ibid.* This custom is also said to be done in order to prevent the bear from crying out in its death agony. Deniker (Seeland), p. 307 says that they sometimes finish the animal with a spear. Von Schrenck notes, p. 711, that the blood which is lost is immediately covered with snow. It may be remarked here that the Tahltan, after killing a bear "gather the remains and the blood that is not required and cover if it possible." MS. notes, J. Teit.

⁴⁸⁵ Hawes, p. 199.

Ainu influence upon the Gilyak ceremony, although the participation of a shaman is no more typical of the Ainu than of the Gilyak.

Returning to the Gilyak of the mainland, the bear's corpse is now stretched out on the snow, the head resting on the forepaws, with the face of the beast toward the west.⁴⁸⁶ The people now seat themselves and eat up the cold victuals which were carried by the bear.⁴⁸⁷ After this the sib mates skin the bear and cut up the flesh according to customary rules and with great solemnity.⁴⁸⁸

The head is left attached to the skin and is now carried back to the house of the host. It is not taken in at the regular doorway, however, but through the smoke hole.⁴⁸⁹ The head man of the sib catches it and, striking it lightly with a stick, says, "Remember this. that some particular old man and some particular old woman

⁴⁸⁶ See sketch, Von Schrenck, p. 712.

⁴⁸⁷ See Sternberg (1), p. 263. A girdle, which is part of the beast's "harness," is provided with little pockets which are filled with eatables of various kinds when the bear is taken out of its cage. These are provisions for the post-mortem journey. The Saghalin Ainu also provide the bear with a provision belt (Labbé, p. 238) and a similar practice is to be found among the Koryak. Sternberg (1), p. 267.

⁴⁸⁸ Von Schrenck says (p. 712) that the animal is laid on its back and the skin slit *from the neck downwards*, a practice which corresponds with that of certain tribes of northeastern America.

⁴⁸⁹ Sternberg (1), p. 268; Von Schrenck, p. 715, quoting the observations of Ditmar and Brevern, supplemented by what he had heard from the Gilyak, but had not witnessed himself, describes this custom as follows: One of the old men takes the bear's skin with the head attached, together with certain other objects (*inao* and fir branches) and circles the house three times. Stopping before the window, the panel (made of fish skin) is taken out and the skin, head and other things introduced. After the window pane is replaced the figure of a toad made of birch bark is attached to the outside of it, (see sketch, p. 716) while inside the figure of a bear carved of wood and dressed in Gilyak costume (pl. LVIII, fig. 3) is set up in the place of honor. Von Schrenck's interpretation is that the toad is a scapegoat upon which the guilt of slaying the bear is laid. Hence it must remain outside in contradistinction to the bear which is brought inside and treated with great respect. Sternberg regards this custom as contributing evidence to the hypothesis that the Gilyak were anciently a more northerly people (see Klementz, p. 221) at which period the smoke hole was the regular entrance to their dwelling. In my opinion, however, the custom must be correlated with similar practices among the other peoples in Asia, Europe and North America where there is a taboo upon bringing the bear or other game animals into the dwelling through the ordinary entrance. Even among the Gilyak the bear is not the only animal treated in this way. According to Seeland (Archiv für Anth., p. 796), a slain boar is introduced through the "window."

nourished you.”⁴⁹⁰ The women meanwhile beat upon a log of wood which serves as a drum. The old man lays the head and skin upon a frame work especially erected for the purpose.⁴⁹¹ Under the head is placed a quiver of arrows and near it tobacco and eatables. The carcass is kept outdoors under a frame shelter and when any portion of the meat is brought into the dwelling it is always introduced through the smoke hole⁴⁹² or window.

According to Sternberg the next part of the festival is called “the day of the feeding of the head” (of the bear). Various kinds of victuals are prepared and part of every dish is put in a special vessel and placed before the head of the beast.⁴⁹³ At the same time the cooking of the bear’s own meat is started.⁴⁹⁴ No one partakes of the bear’s flesh, however, until the next day, which is called “the day of the reception (Bewirtung) of the *Narch-en*.”⁴⁹⁵

Before the bear can be eaten, however, a neat cajolery is carried out. The women prepare a bandage which is placed between the eyes and the tip of the snout of the beast. In the center of it is the representation of a toad, similar to the one pasted

⁴⁹⁰ Sternberg (1), p. 268. “Gedenke dessen, dasz dich der und der alte Mann, die und die alte Frau genährt hat.”

⁴⁹¹ Sternberg, p. 268, calls this “Ehrennarte.” Von Schrenck illustrates the scene in realistic fashion. See pl. XLVIX.

⁴⁹² Sternberg, *ibid*.

⁴⁹³ Many elaborately carved utensils are used only upon the occasion of a bear festival. See Von Schrenck’s remarks, p. 717 and pl. I, LI. New ones are sometimes carved during the festival.

⁴⁹⁴ Although Von Schrenck does not mention the fact, Sternberg (1), p. 269, says that the fire is made with a “sacred” flint and steel which is sib property and passes from generation to generation, being kept in custody by the head man. This observer writes that the bear meat is cooked in a special vessel outdoors. In Von Schrenck’s account, on the other hand, it is done inside the house, (p. 716), and is the prerogative of the old men, who remain there alone with the dogs. Women, girls, and even young men have no part in it. They prepare some of the side dishes, however, but out of sight of the animal, p. 718. “The work goes on,” he says, “slowly, thoughtfully, and in a certain way festively.” Melted snow must be used instead of water. Prior to cooking, every part of the animal must be placed before it in order to secure its permission. After cooking, the various parts of the bear are also placed in the animal’s special dish so that the beast can enjoy them first. Salt is forbidden as an ingredient in any of the food prepared during the festival (cf. the Saghalin Ainu, Labbé, p. 256 and Lapps op. cit.), because the beast will be frightened by the sputtering.

⁴⁹⁵ *Narch-aryn-ku* (Sternberg [1], p. 269).

outside of the window. The purpose of this is to deceive the bear into the belief that it is this evil being who has caused his death and to indicate to the animal at the same time that it is the Gilyak who have treated him as an honored guest and, in their sympathy for his fate have undertaken to dry his tears. This deception exonerates them from all blame and their repast upon the bear's flesh can now be enjoyed to the full.⁴⁹⁶

Sternberg writes that only the *Narch-en* are permitted to eat the bear's flesh⁴⁹⁷ while the host and members of his sib must content themselves with a thick rice soup with broth made from the animal's meat. These honored guests arranged themselves upon the sleeping benches in the dwelling and the greatest delight of the host is to encourage them to eat and drink to excess.⁴⁹⁸

The last day of the feast is termed "the day of the departure of the *Narch-en*." The host piles up their sledges with eatables, including some of the bear meat which had not been consumed, and, reciprocally, the *Narch-en* make gifts to the bear. At the

⁴⁹⁶ Von Schrenck, pp. 719-20. Sketch, p. 720. Sternberg does not refer to this custom. The former authority also refers to, and illustrates the use of, one or more agate pebbles (of Chinese origin) which are attached to the forehead. He thinks this is an attempt to place the bear in the category of a deity by an imitation of the *urna* of a Buddha, an idea which the author believes them to have borrowed from the Chinese.

⁴⁹⁷ (1), p. 269. Cf. Von Schrenck, p. 721. However, according to the latter's description, who does not distinguish the *Narch-en* as a group, the women and children get portions of the meat indirectly from the dishes of the guests, to whom it has been directly served. The head of the bear belongs to the celebrating sib. Hawes says the heart is divided among the "most honored" individuals (p. 200). It assures them of a good hunting season.

⁴⁹⁸ Sternberg, pp. 269-70. A most astonishing custom is referred to in this connection. "Ja, die Liebenswürdigkeit des Wirts wird so weit getrieben, dass er, wenn der Gast sich an der fetten Suppe übergessen hat und sie von sich zu geben beginnt, ehrerbietig seinen Mund drunter hält und das Vomierte schluckt."

Von Schrenck (p. 722) refers to two customs observed as the guests depart from the feast which are of some little comparative interest. An old man with a fir branch stood at the door and lightly hit every person going out who had eaten any bear meat. Upon stepping outside the guests were snowballed by the boys while the women drummed (cf. Ostyak).

last moment, for example, they will often lead several of their dogs up to where the bear's skin lies and tie them there.⁴⁹⁹ Finally, there is the custom called "treading upon the threshold"⁵⁰⁰ to be performed, and then they depart. On the same day the dogs presented by the *Narch-en*, as well as others, are sacrificed in the same arena where the bear met its death. They are admonished in the following words: "Go to your master. Go! climb up the highest mountain. Change your skin and come down again next year as a bear so that I see you. Do that, come down again, go now nicely!"⁵⁰¹

The dogs are laid out on the snow just as the bear was and later their flesh is eaten.⁵⁰²

The Gold, Oltscha, and Orochi Bear Festivals.—The bear festivals of the Gold,⁵⁰³ Oltscha,⁵⁰⁴ and Orochi⁵⁰⁵ seem to parallel the Gilyak ceremonies in their principal features, although we do not have any published accounts⁵⁰⁶ which are comparable in their details with those available for the study of the Gilyak celebration. According to Von Schrenck, who was fortunate enough to witness an Oltscha ceremony, the affair is carried out in a much less spontaneous spirit. His impression was that the observances were conducted very formally, even pedantically, and he therefore

⁴⁹⁹ Sternberg (1), p. 270.

⁵⁰⁰ *lymysyn-sytshywynd*. It is the exchange of the *nitsch* already referred to.

⁵⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 270-1. The head of the bear with all of the presents made to it is taken along. The dogs have *inao* bound to their heads. They are killed by strangulation. Hawes notes the dog sacrifice (p. 201).

⁵⁰² This repast is limited to the members of the sib which held the festival, both sexes participating.

⁵⁰³ See Ravenstein, p. 379 *seq.*; Atkinson, p. 482 *seq.*

⁵⁰⁴ Von Schrenck, pp. 723-8; Frazer (p. 197, note) says that "the Oltscha are probably the same as the Orochi," but Dr. W. Jochelson tells me that they are not to be identified. The Oltscha may be a subdivision (a sib) of the Orochi. I have therefore thought it best to keep them separate for the purpose of this study. Von Schrenck's map gives the approximate location of these peoples.

⁵⁰⁵ Fraser, pp. 36-9. It is interesting to note that on the Tundja River "women take part on the bear feasts, while among the Orochi of the River Vi, the women will never even touch the bear flesh."

⁵⁰⁶ Sternberg's forthcoming work on the "Tribes of the Amur River," in the Jesup series, will, no doubt, serve to fill in this gap.

concluded that it was not well integrated in their culture and was probably borrowed by them from the Gilyak.⁵⁰⁷

*The Ainu Bear Festival.*⁵⁰⁸—Let us now turn to another people of eastern Asia, who, like the Amur tribes, perform an elaborate, ritualized, public slaughter of bears at periodic intervals. This is the climax of the so-called “bear festival” of the Ainu which has so often led to the characterization of these people as “bear worshippers.”⁵⁰⁹ Without a somewhat deeper analysis of this concept, however, in terms of their philosophy of nature, a misconception of the rôle of the bear in their beliefs and practices is likely to arise. That is to say, individual bears or the species at large are not worshipped *per se*.

The phenomena of nature present themselves to the Ainu mind, like the Gilyak, only as “appearances”; in reality, they possess individuality, rationality, volitional qualities, etc., which in many cases are conceived to surpass those with which man is endowed. For such creatures, objects, or beings the Ainu use the term “*kamui*”⁵¹⁰ and it may also be applied to human beings who, for one reason or another, are distinguished by superior qualities. Thus, as Sternberg, in his able exposition of Ainu religious thought points out, beast and “*kamui*” are practically synonymous terms. To this extent the Ainu pantheon is zoological. But, on the other hand, all “*kamui*” are not objects of worship and it is not to the beasts themselves that offerings and prayers are made, but to their “masters” or “owners.” These are also called *kamui*, but with the appellation of this or that sphere of nature added as, e.g.,

⁵⁰⁷ Von Schrenck, p. 728.

⁵⁰⁸ I have chiefly relied upon the observations of Scheube, Von Siebold, Batchelor Greey, and Labbé. The works of Khauzin and Pilsudski on which Miss Czaplicka based her account (5) have not been accessible to me but there seem to be no striking divergencies in the various descriptions.

⁵⁰⁹ Von Siebold, p. 26; Wood, p. 36; Bird, II, p. 97. Scheube is much more cautious and precise, p. 45.

⁵¹⁰ See references cited in my section on the linguistic terminology for the bear for a further discussion of this term. The rendering of it as “god” has caused a great deal of misunderstanding.

nuburi-kamui "master of the mountain." This particular "owner" is of special interest to us as he is the "master" of the bears. "On the one hand he is a man, on the other, a real bear, only of unusually large size. All other bears are his fellow tribesmen.⁵¹¹ The Ainu, of course, come into direct contact only with the latter, but because of the association of these beasts with one of the most important "masters", a being which is conceived to control an important part of their food supply, bears must be treated with the greatest respect. The slaughter of a bear represents the departure of the "soul" of the animal to its "master" and a subsequent return to earth is expected, thus completing a cycle of the profoundest importance to the Ainu mind.⁵¹²

Although the bear festival is no longer held in many Ainu communities, it was formerly characteristic of the natives of Yezo and Saghalin but was completely unknown to the Ainu of the Kuriles. In Torii's opinion it was not customary, either, among the ancient Ainu of Japan, and he therefore concludes that the ceremonies were transmitted by diffusion from the Gilyak to the natives of Yezo and Saghalin and not vice versa.⁵¹³ We shall return to this question of borrowing at a subsequent point in our study, but let us now proceed to a summary description of the Ainu festival itself.

When bears are hunted and killed, cubs are often captured,⁵¹⁴ taken to the Ainu villages and confined in cages, where they are fed and fattened for the annual festivals which occur in the autumn, usually in September or October.⁵¹⁵ Very frequently,

⁵¹¹ Sternberg (2), pp. 425-6.

⁵¹² Cf. Batchelor, e.g., pp. 479, 481, 482.

⁵¹³ Torrii, p. 256. Laufer, in a review of Torrii's work (A.A., vol. 21, p. 307) advances the view that the Ainu were a northern people who were migrating southward and met the Japanese coming northward from their earlier home on the southeast coast of Asia. See, also, Laufer (2). Von Siebold (p. 13) at an earlier date also maintained a similar hypothesis.

⁵¹⁴ St. John, p. 252; Czaplicka (5), p. 296.

⁵¹⁵ Scheube, p. 45; Dixon, p. 43. Batchelor (1) refers to a confinement of two to three years. Cf. Labbé, p. 227 (Saghalin Ainu). St. John (p. 252) saw four or five bears in cages in some villages. For photographs of Ainu bear cages, see Batchelor, pl. xxiii. Hitchcock, pl. cxiii and a Japanese drawing pl. cxiv. Labbé has a photograph of a Saghalin Ainu bear cage with a woman putting food in it (p. 236).

before being imprisoned these cubs, when very young, are suckled by the wife of the hunter.⁵¹⁶ Batchelor at first was doubtful regarding the rumors he had heard regarding this practice but later was able to observe the custom at first hand.⁵¹⁷ He also says that "sometimes very young cubs may be seen living in the huts with the people, where they play with the children and are cared for with great affection."⁵¹⁸ "But as soon as they are grown big and strong enough to cause a little pain when they hug a person, or when their claws are too powerful to be pleasant, they are placed in a cage strongly made of pieces of timber. Here they generally remain until they arrive at the age of two or three years, at which time they are killed for the feast."⁵¹⁹

Although the descriptions of Ainu bear festivals differ in minor details of procedure and custom, yet all observers are in substantial agreement regarding certain characteristic features which we shall here attempt to summarize.⁵²⁰ The festival is called "iomante."⁵²¹ In every case it is evident that the affair is communal in nature. Not only friends and relatives in the village, but sometimes individuals from other settlements as well,⁵²² are invited by the owner of the bear, who is also the host. The honor

⁵¹⁶ Von Siebold, p. 26; Scheube, p. 45; St. John, p. 252; Bird, II, p. 99; Dixon, p. 43; Czaplicka (5), p. 296. Frazer, p. 187, quotes a Japanese writer of 1652 to the same effect. (He claims that this is the first published account of an Ainu bear festival.) Von Schrenck, III, p. 735, refers to the same observation. See MacRitchie's discussion of this point, pp. 8-18. Also pl. II, fig. 9.

⁵¹⁷ p. 484. One one occasion while he was preaching at one end of a hut "a group of women were sitting in a circle at the other passing a young cub around to be nursed a little by each woman in turn." In his previous book, "The Ainu of Japan" (1892), he had stated (p. 173) that after a five year residence he had never seen it done. All references cited as Batchelor refer to Batchelor (1).

⁵¹⁸ p. 483.

⁵¹⁹ p. 484. Also Scheube, p. 45. Labbé says, p. 235, that although a bear being reared for the purpose of a festival usually belongs to the most well-to-do man of a village, *everyone* shares in the honor of feeding the animal. In summer the bear is taken to bathe in a neighboring stream. On these occasions, also, the matter is considered of interest to all of the villagers. They follow the animal and talk to it in a friendly manner. See illustration, p. 237.

⁵²⁰ For the Saghalin Ainu, Labbé's account has been utilized.

⁵²¹ Scheube, p. 45, Batchelor, p. 481. Torii, p. 254. It means "to send away."

⁵²² Batchelor, p. 485; Scheube, p. 45; Czaplicka (5), p. 297, "usually, practically the whole village is invited."

of giving the feast is so great that the host feels amply repaid in the prestige he derives, although it is necessary that he provide everyone with food and plenty of *saké*.⁵²³ Batchelor gives a characteristic form of invitation to the festival as follows: "I, so and so, am about to sacrifice the dear little divine thing who resides among the mountains. My friends and masters, come ye to the feast; we will then unite in the great pleasure of sending the god away. Come."⁵²⁴

The preliminary ceremonies of the festival among the Yezo Ainu are held in the hut of the host. Libations are made to the "owner" of the fire, to the house "owner,"⁵²⁵ and, according to Batchelor, to other "deities" who are all invited to partake of the feast.⁵²⁶ *Inao* are placed in certain parts of the house, on the *nusa*⁵²⁷ and on the four corners of the bear cage.⁵²⁸ The men wear bark "crowns."⁵²⁹ The next step in the procedure centers attention upon the bear. In Scheube's account the animal is offered food and *saké* which is followed by a dance of the women and girls around the cage, accompanied by singing.⁵³⁰ Some of them address the beast tearfully in terms of endearment and the woman who

⁵²³ Rice wine. Cf. Labbé, p. 235. The prestige which accrues to the host is paralleled among the Gilyak and also among the more distant Ostyak.

⁵²⁴ p. 486.

⁵²⁵ Batchelor, p. 486, Scheube, p. 47; Czaplicka (5), p. 297. The "owners" or "masters" of the hut and fire are important secondary *kamui*, according to Sternberg (2), p. 427.

⁵²⁶ p. 486.

⁵²⁷ See Batchelor, p. 486.

⁵²⁸ Scheube, p. 46; Batchelor, p. 486. See Chapters ix and x in the latter's work for a general account of *inao* and *nusa*. Also, consult Sternberg (2), *op. cit.*

⁵²⁹ See Batchelor, pp. 158-63, for a general discussion and illustration of these head ornaments. The author erroneously interprets them as an indication of "totemism" because they are decorated with animal representations, particularly of the bear, or parts of the animal, e.g., its claws. They are worn on all important festive or ceremonial occasions. Cf. Greey, p. 134 and sketch on p. 100; also Scheube, pp. 46, 224, and pl. iv, fig. 5.

⁵³⁰ Cf. Greey, pp. 133-5, who says the first part of the festival, occupying a day, is called "*hinzinzo*" (feeding the bear). See illustration, p. 136; Scheube, p. 47; Hitchcock, pl. cxiv, shows the women engaged in a dance. Czaplicka (5), p. 297, says the foster mother of the bear and other women who have reared bears perform a special dance of their own at this point in the festival. Scheube describes the dancing in considerable detail.

had nursed the animal as a cub exhibits what appears to be genuine grief at all of the proceedings.⁵³¹ Batchelor simply mentions the fact that at this point the men solemnly approach the cage and are followed by the women and children who "sing, dance and clap their hands."⁵³² The part played by the women seems to be of considerable importance, for among the Saghalin Ainu it is the special duty of the older women during the day prior to the feast⁵³³ to take turns lamenting before the cage of the bear.

Before the bear is taken out of its cage and slaughtered, a ceremonial address⁵³⁴ is usually made to it which, from a comparative point of view, is of great interest.⁵³⁵ The animal is informed that it is going to be sent to its ancestors, by the Ainu making the speech, who also "prays pardon for what they are about to do, hopes it will not be angry, tells it what an honour is about to be conferred upon it, and comforts it with the consolation that a large number of *inao* and plenty of wine, cakes, and other good cheer will be sent along with it . . . and that if it be a good and proper bear it will appear again to be treated in like manner."

⁵³¹ Various authors mention the expressions of grief manifested by this individual at various points in the proceedings, especially when the beast is killed. See, e.g., Von Siebold, p. 26; Greey, p. 138; Labbé, p. 244; Scheube, p. 47. Mrs. Bird, II, p. 101, records that "In some villages it is customary for the foster mother of the bear to utter piercing wails while he is delivered to his murderers, and after he is slain to beat each one of them with a branch of a tree."

⁵³² Batchelor, p. 486.

⁵³³ Labbé, pp. 239, 241.

⁵³⁴ Says Czaplicka (5), p. 297, "Before the ceremonies, apologies are made to the spirits for the capture and detention of the bear, assurances are given that the treatment of the bear has been marked with the greatest tenderness, and it is explained that, as they cannot feed the animal any longer, they are obliged to kill it."

⁵³⁵ Whereas, among the Ainu, this address evidently forms an integral part of the bear festival itself, although not mentioned by Scheube, it is linked elsewhere with addresses of propitiation, apology, and explanation offered to the animal by the fact that, although no details are given, Mrs. Bird says (II p. 101), "When a bear is trapped or wounded by an arrow, the hunters go through an apologetic or propitiatory ceremony." This suggests that aside from the highly conventionalized ceremonial feast Ainu hunters in the woods may also address the bears they kill in a similar fashion. But, observers have been so much impressed with the bear festival and so few, if any, of them have evidently traveled with the the Ainu hunter in the bush, that descriptions of what goes on at the annual public ceremonies has entirely eclipsed the less picturesque customs which probably occur whenever a hunter kills a bear.

Although not containing all the points just mentioned, Batchelor essays to give one of these addresses verbatim:

O thou divine one, thou wast sent into the world for us to hunt. O thou precious little divinity, we worship thee; pray hear our prayer. We have nourished thee and brought thee up with a deal of pains and trouble, all because we love thee so. Now, as thou hast grown big, we are about to send thee to thy father and mother. When thou comest to them please speak well for us, and tell them how kind we have been; please come to us again and we will sacrifice thee.⁵³⁶

Among the Saghalin Ainu the bear festival takes place in winter and at night.⁵³⁷ Before the beast is taken out of its cage an address⁵³⁸ similar in purport to that made by the people of Yezo is made. The bear is reminded how well it has been cared for and the orator then proceeds to tell the animal of the great festival which is about to be held in its honor. "Be not afraid," he says, "We will not hurt you. We will only kill you and send you to the god of the forest who loves you. We are about to offer you a good dinner, the best you have ever eaten among us, and we will all weep for you together. The Ainu who will kill you is the best shot among us. There he is, he weeps and asks your forgiveness; you will feel almost nothing, it will be done so quickly. We cannot feed you always, as you will understand. We have done enough for you; it is now your turn to sacrifice yourself for us. You will ask God to send us, for the winter, plenty of otters and sables, and for the summer, seals and fish in abundance. Do not forget our messages, we love you much, and our children will never forget you." The animal is then given the meal promised, during which there is much ceremonial lamentation on the part of both men and women. He is then taken out of the cage and led around it three times and also around the house of his owner and the orator. After being tied to a tree the orator again addresses the animal in a speech which sometimes lasts until dawn. "Remember," he says, "Remember! I remind you of your whole life and of

⁵³⁶ p. 487.

⁵³⁷ In this respect it parallels the Gilyak ceremonies.

⁵³⁸ Quoted from Labbé, pp. 241-3, 152 (translation by Frazer, pp. 188-9). The speech is not stereotyped. Labbé says that, although the words and phraseology differ with different speakers, the content is always similar.

the services we have rendered you. It is now for you to do your duty. Do not forget what I have asked you. You will tell the gods to give us riches, that our hunters may return from the forest laden with rich furs and animals good to eat; that our fishers may find troops of seals on the shore and in the sea, and that their nets may crack under the weight of the fish. We have no hope but in you. The evil spirits laugh at us, and too often they are unfavorable and malignant to us, but they will bow before you. We have given you food and joy and health, now we kill you in order that you may in return send riches to us and to our children."⁵³⁹

Returning to the Yezo ceremonies, we shall not pause to refer to any of the details connected with getting the bear out of the cage and securing it with ropes so that the animal may be led about.⁵⁴⁰ But, once outside there ensues a period in the festival when everyone present tries to tease the animal into a rage.⁵⁴¹ This may be done to tire the bear. The villagers form a ring around the beast and shout and clap their hands.⁵⁴² They shoot blunt arrows at the bear⁵⁴³ and poke it with sticks; "the wilder the bear becomes the more delighted do the people get."⁵⁴⁴ Finally the beast is tied to a stake⁵⁴⁵ and then "a round piece of wood about

⁵³⁹ Labbé says that in some villages there is no speech made before the animal is taken out of its cage, all of this elocutionary display being made just prior to slaughtering the bear. Dog sacrifice also accompanies the feast among the Saghalin Ainu (see Labbé, p. 240, 251) which is a feature not characteristic of the Yezo natives but parallels the Gilyak procedure.

⁵⁴⁰ See Batchelor, pp. 487-8; Scheube, p. 48; MacRitchie, pl. x, fig. 8; Labbé, p. 244 *seq.* and photograph p. 233.

⁵⁴¹ Batchelor, p. 488; Landor, p. 281; Bird, II, p. 101; Greey, p. 137. In the account given by the last observer the teasing of the bear occupied most of the second day of the festival after which the bear was put back into its cage again. This savors of the Gilyak festival as the Ainu usually seemed to proceed more directly to the slaughter of the beast.

⁵⁴² Batchelor, p. 488.

⁵⁴³ *Ibid.*, Scheube, p. 48; Landor, p. 281. See also Hitchcock, pl. cxv and the illustration in Greey, p. 138 and the text, p. 137.

⁵⁴⁴ Batchelor, p. 488. It may be noted here that in Labbé's account (p. 248) the bear, before being killed, is led three times around the cage in which it has been confined and also the same number of times around the house of its owner, and that of the old man who gave the speech. This is another feature which suggests Gilyak influence.

two feet long" is thrust into the animal's jaws. "Next two men come forward, one on each side of the bear and seize its fore-legs and pull them out as far as they can. Then two others will in a like manner catch hold of the two hind-legs. When all this has been done quite satisfactorily, the two long poles . . . which are called *ok numba ni* i.e., 'poles for strangling' are brought forward. One is placed under its throat, and the other upon the nape of its neck."⁵⁴⁶ The beast is then choked to death.⁵⁴⁷

The bear having been killed, its corpse,⁵⁴⁸ or its skin with the head still attached,⁵⁴⁹ becomes the object of further ceremonies. It is placed upon a mat either before the *nusa*⁵⁵⁰ or in the hut,⁵⁵¹ is decorated with *inao* and various other objects⁵⁵² and food and

⁵⁴⁶ Batchelor, *op. cit.* This stake is ornamented with *inao* and leaves of *arundinaria*. It is called, *Tushop-ni* "tree having the rope." Cf. Landor, p. 281. In Labbé's description a tree serves the same purpose which is also decorated with *inao*.

⁵⁴⁶ Batchelor, p. 489; Scheube, p. 48; Von Siebold, p. 26; Landor, p. 281; Greey, p. 137 and illustration p. 139; Hitchcock, pl. cxvi; MacRitchie, pl. x, fig. 9. Cf. Czaplicka (5), p. 297. Bird, II, p. 100, writes that they shout in chorus as the animal dies: "We kill you, O Bear! Come back soon into an Ainu." This method is mentioned in the earliest account of the bear festival (1652) quoted, Frazer, p. 188. It is interesting to note that the same method was formerly used to kill slaves on the north-west coast of America. See Simpson, vol. 1, p. 243.

⁵⁴⁷ Although the choking method is mentioned by so many writers it may be noted that in Batchelor's account the animal is first dispatched with an arrow (p. 489) and then choked. Everyone desires to have a hand in the latter process; in fact, the "people become so very excited at the time the cub is throttled that they sometimes trample upon one another in their eagerness to have a hand in the death." No blood must fall on the ground and it is very unlucky for the dying animal to utter a single groan (p. 490). Cf. the Gilyak procedure. In Saghalin (Labbé, p. 251) the animal is killed with bow and arrow. The executioner then throws down his weapon and falls down by the bear and weeps, as does the old woman who has been principally charged with seeing that the bear has been properly fed.

⁵⁴⁸ Scheube, p. 489. The bear is not skinned until the following day when its head and hide are decorated and laid before the *nusa* just as its body had been, p. 51. A similar practice is found in Saghalin, Labbé, p. 252 *seq.*

⁵⁴⁹ Batchelor, p. 491. Possibly the head alone is sufficient in some villages as Howard (p. 124) states that immediately after the bear was killed its head was cut off and *inao* stuck in it. See, e.g., the splendid color plate reproduced by MacRitchie (pl. VII) taken from a *kakemono* in the Leiden Museum and painted by Shunri Chishima i.e., the painter of the Ainu.

⁵⁵⁰ Scheube, pp. 48, 51; Greey, p. 414.

⁵⁵¹ Batchelor, p. 491, the mat is called *inao-so*.

⁵⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 491, earrings, beads, old sword hilts, a Japanese mirror. Scheube, p. 48, refers to the fact that in the ceremony he observed while the women were dancing

drink are put before it.⁵⁵³ Chronologically, some such ceremony is usually performed prior to the cooking and eating of the animal's flesh.⁵⁵⁴ As Batchelor gives the most details regarding the actual procedure I shall mainly follow his account, as it throws more direct light upon the psychological significance of the ritual to the Ainu mind.⁵⁵⁵

Food and drink having been laid before the animal's head and skin, one of the Ainu addresses the bear thus: "O cub, we give you these *inao*, cakes, and dried fish; take them to your parents, and say 'I have been brought up for a long time by an Ainu father and mother, and have been kept from all trouble and harm. As I am

before the bear's cage "swords and sacred quivers known as *ikayup* or *ikor-kamui*, were suspended on the hedge (*nusa*). There were also bows and arrows, the latter always three in number, with which the bear was to be shot, and ear-rings and necklaces, to be laid on the bear after death." See pl. ix. The ear-rings and necklaces are considered proper for a female bear. Howard (p. 126), while referring to the fact that two quarters of the animal and its head lay undisturbed for two days before the greater *Inao* (*nusa*?) "as if in consecration or as an offering," does not give any ritual details. He concludes by noting that on the third day the "head alone retained its place, the rest was being cut up into pieces with a show of unusual interest." Cf. Greey, p. 143, and frontispiece.

⁵⁵³ Batchelor, p. 491. First "a piece of its own flesh is cut off and placed under the snout (*notpok-omap* "that under the jaw"), then there is put before it a piece of dried fish (*Sat-chep-shike* "the bundle of dried fish"), a moustache lifter put up in a parcel, millet dumplings, a cup of its own meat boiled ("the cup containing the meat is called *marapto itangi*—the cup of the feast."), saké. Scheube, p. 48. Millet mush; millet cake with fish oil poured over it; saké in a can with a drinking cup; chop sticks; moustache lifter provided with spiral shavings (this type is of a special ceremonial kind, see Batchelor, p. 136 and sketch, p. 137). Cf. Greey, p. 143-4. MacRitchie, pl. x, fig. 10, and p. 29. For the Saghalin Ainu we have the same custom recorded. As soon as the animal has been shot, in fact, a little food (rice and potatoes) is set before the dead beast (Labbé, p. 252). From this description there is a greater simplicity in this feature of the ceremony than among the Yezo Ainu.

⁵⁵⁴ It should be mentioned in this connection that the ceremonial treatment accorded the bear's corpse prior to eating it may be repeated in front of its head and skin at a later period in the festival. Cf. Scheube, p. 51, and Labbé, p. 256. According to the description of Greey, however, the feast was held on the night of the third day of the festival immediately after killing the beast (p. 141) and the ceremonies before the head and skin followed on the succeeding day (p. 143).

⁵⁵⁵ Scheube shows the Ainu seated before the corpse in pl. viii. Each man had his drinking cup set before him and they made libations to the animal. It is stated that the head man is supposed to make the first libation using the cup, etc., set before the bear, but in this case he waived this right in favor of the oldest man present.

grown big I am come to thee. I have also brought these *inao*, cakes, and dried fish. Please rejoice!' If you say this to them they will be glad."⁵⁵⁶

Another address which parallels the above is given by Batchelor, except that it contains an explicit statement regarding the very typical belief which they hold: viz., that the bear is expected to return to earth again.⁵⁵⁷ "Do thou again come to this world," they say, "that I, who reared thee, may meet with thee again, and once more bring thee for sacrifice."⁵⁵⁸ After this, "millet dumplings⁵⁵⁹ are threaded on sticks, and placed beside the head. These are said to be for the feast in the new world, for it would never do to appear before one's ancestors without a small present sufficient to provide viands for a meal."⁵⁶⁰ A dance outside the hut follows, after which more *inao* are made and placed on the bear's head. A portion of the animal's own meat, which has meanwhile been boiled, is now placed before it in the cup previously mentioned and bruin is now said to be partaking of the "cup of the feast."⁵⁶¹ After the "little divinity" has finished eating,

⁵⁵⁶ Batchelor, p. 491. Cf. Gilyak speech.

⁵⁵⁷ Cf. Batchelor, p. 487, in address prior to killing; Bird, II, p. 100. Greey, p. 144, records this as follows: "My god, today I, the chief, send you forth as a god. If you come again—as a little bear— next year, I will take care of you. Now you kindly leave." Cf. Gilyak.

⁵⁵⁸ Batchelor, p. 492.

⁵⁵⁹ Cf. Scheube, p. 50. After the libations "the young man who had led the bear from the cage mounted to the roof of a house in order to throw millet cake from a basket among the people." (Translation Hitchcock p. 480). Although from an objective standpoint this custom seems to be of a different character than that referred to by Batchelor, it is possible that there may be subjective associations which, if the details were known, would connect them. In Greey's account millet *seed* is thrown among the crowd immediately after killing the bear (p. 138). It is said to make the Ainu strong when hunting.

⁵⁶⁰ Batchelor, p. 492. See sketch of dumplings. The Saghalin Ainu also take special pains to provide the bear with provisions for its prospective spiritual journey. (Labbé, p. 238.) The women make a sort of belt which is put onto the beast prior to the hour of sacrifice. From it hang little sacks in which are placed various kinds of food. This custom is identical in purpose with that of other Paleo-Siberian tribes, as, e.g., the Koryak and Gilyak. Among the Saghalin natives the bags are torn open just before the bear is slaughtered and he is permitted to devour the contents (p. 248).

⁵⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 493 and 491 (*marapto itangi*). It is also referred to as the "cup of offering" (*ipuni itangi*) because it is offered to the bear.

everyone present takes a small portion of the contents. This seems to be absolutely essential, according to Batchelor, for young and old of both sexes.⁵⁶²

This leads us to the customary observances connected with the eating of the bear. Let us return for a moment to the point in the ceremonies at which the bear was killed, for it is here that we discover a very characteristic practice which, while occurring earlier in the festival, logically falls under the present topic of discussion. I refer to the drinking of the bear's blood. This is done only by the men, and not all of them at that, but by doing so, one imbibes the stalwart virtues of the animal which, above all things, are most to be desired.⁵⁶³ In order to obtain success in hunting the men also smear themselves and their clothes with the blood of the bear.⁵⁶⁴

One gathers the impression from the available accounts, that the flesh of the bear is not only agreeable to the Ainu palate, but on the occasion of a bear festival, at least, the eating of the bear is, on the subjective side, an integral part of the whole ceremonial complex to the extent that it is very necessary that everyone present must have his share. As Batchelor puts it, "Every member of the company partakes of some, (of the meat), however little it may be. It is thus that he obtains communion with his dear little divinity, as he calls the victim. . . . Not to partake of this feast and not to make *inao* would be tantamount to confessing oneself outside the pale of Ainu fellowship. Every particle of the bear, bones excepted, formerly had to be eaten up, even to the entrails, though this rule is now relaxed."⁵⁶⁵ There are apparently

⁵⁶² *Ibid.*, 493.

⁵⁶³ Batchelor, p. 490; Scheube, p. 51. In the latter account the animal is not cut up the same day it is killed but apparently the blood is drunk just the same. Scheube says that none of the women or children drank the blood, although the custom did not forbid them to do so. (It is not a question, perhaps of a definite taboo so much as a basic ideology which makes it desirable for men to acquire virile characteristics inappropriate for women.) Labbé, p. 255, observes that the blood of the bear is drunk warm by all present.

⁵⁶⁴ Batchelor, p. 493, called (*yai-sho-ushi*) "besmearing oneself with good sport" or "successful hunting." It is done when some other animals are killed too (p. 494).

⁵⁶⁵ P. 494; Labbé says guests had to eat up the whole animal before taking their departure. There is a tantalizing parallelism here to the "eat all" custom of some of the

no regulations which forbid women to eat certain parts of the animal,⁵⁶⁶ but special tidbits are sometimes reserved for the hunter and his friends⁵⁶⁷ and other portions are usually eaten raw.⁵⁶⁸ In Saghalin there is a prohibition upon the use of salt and pepper at the feast upon the bear's meat⁵⁶⁹ and it is forbidden to give even a morsel of the flesh to the dogs.⁵⁷⁰

The Simpler Ceremonies of the Gilyaks and Ainu

The practice of capturing young bears, confining them in cages and later killing them in periodic "bear festivals," is, as we have seen, one of the most characteristic features of bear ceremonialism in the Amur-Gulf of Tartary region. It clearly differentiates the peoples of this district from other tribes of Asia and America, among whom the post-mortem observances were performed after killing a bear in the hunt. This distinction, however, although valid enough, does not, as a matter of fact, categorically separate the former tribes from others who practice some sort of bear ceremonialism. The reason for this lies in the fact that it is customary in the Amur-Gulf of Tartary region also to perform post-mortem rites after killing bears in the hunt, although this set of customs has not been described in the detail which observers have lavished upon their more elaborate ceremonies. The nature of these observances among the Gilyak, however, is clearly indicated by Sternberg. In order to understand the meaning of the bear festivals, he writes,⁵⁷¹ we must remember that they are not

northeastern Algonkians, in itself insignificant enough, but in view of the total complex of bear customs suggests an ancient feature which may at one time have had a considerably wider geographical provenience.

⁵⁶⁶ Although there may have been taboos in the past. On Saghalin, e.g., Labbé (p. 255) reported that women were formerly excluded from the banquet upon the bear's flesh.

⁵⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 495. The fat and whites of the eyes which are mixed with the brains and boiled. Called "chopped up fine" (*chitatap*).

⁵⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 493. The entrails cut up fine, sprinkled with salt and eaten raw, are said to impart the prowess and other virtues of the animal; Scheube (p. 50) says the liver is cut in small pieces, salted, and eaten raw. Women and children ate of it, too.

⁵⁶⁹ Labbé, p. 256. Cf. Lapps note 431.

⁵⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 252, 155.

⁵⁷¹ Sternberg (1) p. 272.

"as is usually but falsely assumed, celebrated only at the killing of a house-bear but are held on every occasion when a Gilyak succeeds in slaughtering a bear in the chase. It is true that in such cases the festival assumes less imposing dimensions, but in its essence it remains the same. When the head and skin of a bear killed in the forest are brought into the village, they are accorded a triumphal reception with music and solemn ceremonial. The head is laid on a consecrated scaffold, fed, and treated with offerings, just as at the killing of a house-bear; and the guests of honor (*Narch-en*) are also assembled. So, too, dogs are sacrificed, and the bones of the bear are preserved in the same place and with the same marks of respect as the bones of a house-bear. *Hence, the great winter festival is only an extension of the rite which is observed at the slaughter of every bear.*" (Italics ours).

Labbé, writing of the Saghalin Gilyak, emphasizes the same point. He says that the true bear festival might more properly be called the feast of the hunter, because it takes place every time that a Gilyak kills a bear.⁵⁷² The successful hunter approaches the village crying out "*oïnte!*", a word only used upon the occasion of a bear killing.⁵⁷³ He wears the skin of the animal and upon his arrival the other men beat upon a "*bois sonore*" with sticks. They accompany the hunter to the woods and bring the carcass back. The next day a communal feast is held. *Inao* are manufactured in some villages and the skin and head of the bear are placed upon a sort of scaffold which is decorated with them. The meat of the bear, as well as other kinds of food, are cooked and served by the women. Part of the flesh is boiled⁵⁷⁴ and part roasted. The men can eat it either way but it is taboo to women when roasted.⁵⁷⁵

An old man⁵⁷⁶ usually presides at the feast but the owner of the house in which the affair is held⁵⁷⁷ carves up the bear. This is

⁵⁷² p. 261 *seq.*

⁵⁷³ Labbé says (p. 262) that this word has of itself no signification.

⁵⁷⁴ In immense pots out of doors.

⁵⁷⁵ It is only in summer that women are admitted to participation in the feast itself, although they cook and serve the bear meat in both winter and summer (p. 263).

⁵⁷⁶ Called *Narkh*, p. 264. The important rôle of the *Narch-en* in the Gilyak feasts has already been referred to.

⁵⁷⁷ This is usually the slayer of the bear and he is called upon, as is also the case

no simple matter, as each guest is supposed to receive a morsel of all the different parts of the animal. Preference is shown to the old men and the *narkh*. All of the guests must use a ceremonial knife (which lies on the table) to cut their meat, and if they forget this and use their own knives, the latter become the property of the host.⁵⁷⁸ The head and skin are the property of the latter. He may sell the skin but not the head or paws.

In the case of the other Amur tribes, I have not been able to discover any published information regarding analogous customs, but there are a few allusions recorded for the Ainu which seem to indicate that some such practices were in vogue. I have already referred, in another connection,⁵⁷⁹ to Bird's statement that the Ainu observed some propitiatory ceremonies after killing a bear in the woods and Batchelor writes⁵⁸⁰ that "when a bear has been killed the Ainu sit down and admire it, make their salaams to it, worship it and offer presents of *inao*." "When the skinning is finished," he continues, "the head is decorated with *inao* and thanks offered first to the bear itself and then to the gods for protecting them and rendering them successful." The head, breast, and viscera go to the slayer and the rest of the meat is divided equally among the other hunters participating. A feast is held after their return to the village. Greey⁵⁸¹ says that the carcass of a slain bear was suspended from a tree and *inao* thrust into the liver. A piece of this organ was then cut off and eaten by one of the party with the admonition, "It will make you very strong."

Another interesting feature of Ainu bear hunting which is mentioned by several authors is the custom of taking any part of the

in the periodic festivals, to bear the major portion of the expense of providing provisions, etc. But his exploit is talked about far and near and the prestige derived from this is compensation enough (p. 265).

⁵⁷⁸ Certain bones of the animal are also distributed to the especially invited guests, both men and women, and these had to be handled in a peculiar way. See pp. 265-6.

⁵⁷⁹ In our discussion of conciliatory speeches to the bear in the Ainu festival. Cf. Bird, II, p. 100.

⁵⁸⁰ p. 472.

⁵⁸¹ p. 122.

beast into a dwelling through some other opening than the ordinary doorway.⁵⁸² Correspondences to this practice are, curiously enough, characteristic of such remote peoples as the Lapps on the one hand and the Micmac Indians of eastern America on the other. Among the Ainu, it is also customary to treat other game or fish in this way on certain occasions.⁵⁸³ Except among the Saghalin Ainu⁵⁸⁴ where Gilyak influence may explain the integration of this custom with other ceremonies characteristic of the periodic festivals, it remains connected with the observances of the ordinary hunt.

The performance of some sort of post-mortem rites as part of the ordinary bear hunt by the Amur-Gulf of Tartary peoples thus links them basically with other tribes which observe such customs, but which do not have periodic bear festivals. If more detailed information were forthcoming we might extend to the peoples of this whole region Sternberg's assertion, that the observances which characterize the bear festivals of the Gilyak are really an elaboration of the simpler rites practiced whenever a bear is

⁵⁸² Usually the smoke hole or window. Batchelor (1), pp. 123-4, speaks of this practice in discussing what he calls the "Sacred East Window" of an Ainu dwelling. "When the highest deities are worshipped or when prayers are said to the ancestors they should often be addressed through the window. Also, when *inao* are to be placed among the *nusa* outside, they should be made and consecrated by the hearth and then passed through the window." It is termed *inao kush puyara*, i.e., "the window through which *inao* pass," or *kamui kush puyara*, "the window through which divine beings pass." It is taboo for anyone to look into a hut through this window. Greey (p. 131) gives a legendary explanation of this prohibition. In ancient times there was a god, skilled in hunting and fishing, who generously put the meat of bears, other game and fish in at the windows of Ainu dwellings. He finally became offended and left the Ainu country, but ever since it is said that only gods should look into a dwelling through the window. Greey adds that when going hunting, a woman passes her husband's implements to him through the window and that on his return everything captured is brought in through the same opening. See also sketch by a Japanese artist showing a woman passing out a spear to her husband (p. 173).

⁵⁸³ Batchelor (*op. cit.*) refers to deer and birds specifically, and Greey, (*op. cit.*) to game in general. St. John (p. 253) says the first fish of the season are treated in this way.

⁵⁸⁴ Labbé, pp. 255-6. The head, skin, and meat are passed through the smoke hole when they are introduced into a dwelling during the course of the bear festival. I have not found any reference to such a practice in the descriptions of Yezo bear festivals.

killed. At any rate, such an hypothesis is very illuminating from an historical viewpoint, suggesting, as it does, that the periodic festivals are probably more recent cultural developments than the more widely distributed rites observed in connection with the hunt. Whether the Gilyak, as Torii maintains, actually represent the dynamic center in a process by which the more elaborate bear festival was transmitted by diffusion to the Ainu and other peoples of the region, it is difficult to say. The more basic question to my mind is the extent to which the simpler rites were practiced, and their characteristic form. The *direction* in which the borrowing of specific features has taken place does not, it seems to me, admit of a very satisfactory solution without some further knowledge of these observances among the peoples of this entire region.

DISPOSAL OF REMAINS

Even after the carcass of a bear has been respectfully treated in a conventional manner and the flesh eaten, there are still additional obligations for the hunter to fulfil. It is necessary that the bones of the beast, and more especially the skull, should be disposed of properly. We undoubtedly have here, despite rather meager information on the whole, a series of customs associated with the bear, which form part of a much wider category of practices observed in connection with the disposal of remains of other game animals. I shall endeavor to show, therefore, a relative consistency in the treatment of the remains of bears as compared with the other animals. This will apply both to the objective practices which we shall review and, to a large extent, to the explanation most frequently advanced for the customs.

In by far the majority of the tribes studied in northern North America and Siberia as well, a special emphasis is placed upon the preservation of the bear's skull, which is usually placed upon the branch of a tree in the woods, on a pole in some instances, or deposited in an ostensibly sacred place in the forest, sometimes along with the skulls of other animals. The treatment accorded other parts of the skeleton show a much greater variation in practice, but associated with these customs is a widespread taboo which is offered as an explanation of them among a large number of peoples.

It is said that the bones of the bear, and often other game animals, must be kept out of the way of dogs.⁵⁸⁵ Should a dog gnaw or even touch them the "spirit" or "owner" of the animals will be offended and misfortune or poor luck in hunting will result.

NORTH AMERICA

Eastern Woodlands

Among the *Wabanaki* peoples, so far as we have information, it was the custom to hang a bear's skull on the tree near the spot where the animal was killed.⁵⁸⁶ Information regarding the conventional disposal of the other bones is not available, but in some of the tribes of the group, if not all,⁵⁸⁷ there was a taboo upon allowing dogs to touch them, as well as the bones of other animals.

That the custom of hanging up the skull of the bear may have been practiced by the more southerly coastal Algonkians is a plausible interpretation advanced by Skinner⁵⁸⁸ to account for the absence of bear bones and teeth in many Algonkian refuse sites of this region.

⁵⁸⁵ This taboo is very widespread in North America and applies to many different species (see, e.g., the bibliographical note in Frazer, p. 259). Its special association with the bear is much narrower than the geography of the Ursidae. Among the peoples where this taboo applies to bear bones we have attempted to indicate the other animals for which it holds so far as information is available.

⁵⁸⁶ Micmac (Joe Toney); Malecite (Mechling, p. 101, note). Care was taken to place the bones and skull "out of the reach of other animals, so as not to scare away the spirits of the bears." Although there is no specific reference here to placing the skull on a tree the practice of closely related tribes leads one to suppose that this was probably the case. St. Francis Abenaki—One informant stated that it was formerly the custom to hang up the skulls of other animals, e.g., caribou, moose, deer, in a similar way so that the teeth would distinctly show. One of Hind's guides (1, p. 53) was an Abenaki from either Pierreville or Becancour (p. 5) and when traveling with the explorer on the east branch of the Moisie River he said, referring to a bear he had killed the previous year, "You can see the tree where I killed him and his split skull hanging on a pole close by" (the animal had been slaughtered with an axe). The contemporary Penobscot do not know of this custom.

⁵⁸⁷ See Malecite (previous note). Among the Abenaki there was a taboo against allowing dogs to gnaw the bones of beaver as well as bear. The former were thrown back into the water, as were fish bones. The bones of caribou were left where the animal was killed and the dogs were not forbidden them. Marten bones were collected and left in a pile.

⁵⁸⁸ (7), p. 117.

The *Montagnais-Naskapi* either erect a special pole⁵⁸⁹ on which they hang the skulls of bears, and sometimes those of other animals, or utilize the branch of a tree for the same purpose.⁵⁹⁰ It is also thought desirable to place tobacco in the mouth, or in some other orifice of the cranium.⁵⁹¹ The latter is sometimes painted with one or more bars of red pigment.⁵⁹² Dogs are not allowed to touch the bones of a bear and the necessity for carrying out this restriction is frequently given as the reason for treating the remains

⁵⁸⁹ James Mackenzie (p. 415) is the earliest observer to record this custom. He writes, "The bones being torn from the flesh or rather the flesh from the bones, they are with ceremony, suspended to a *mai* (Arbre de mai—flagpole) which has been previously erected for that purpose." Cf. Chambers, p. 316, who presents a sketch of one of these poles with several skulls attached to it. Among the Mistassini (MS text, F. G. Speck) the skulls of bears are carefully picked clean of meat and carried about all winter. When a family makes its spring camp, a pole, carefully peeled of bark, is erected on which they are hung. In some cases these skulls are even carried from one summer until the following spring in order to bring them all together in the same place. Dr. T. Michelson writes me (March 13, 1924) to the same effect. He says, "At graves formerly there was a staff. On this were placed bear head bones and the head bones of other animals, even that of a duck." References to the hanging up of parts of other animals are: Chambers (p. 316), beaver skulls; (p. 318) pike's head on a pole (near Lake Tschotagama). The Mistassini also preserve the chin, lower lip and tongue string of a bear, which are kept in a birch bark receptacle. The claws must not be destroyed either. MS. notes F.G.S.

⁵⁹⁰ Hind (p. 183) refers to a bear skull stuck on a dead branch of a tree near Trout Lake. It had been killed by Dominique, chief of the Moisie Band, two years before. The explorer wished to take it down but was dissuaded by an adopted son of Dominique who said it would be unlucky to take it away. The Indian related the story of a man who was bitten in the leg and mauled by a bear, the result of his indiscretion in taking a skull from a tree in order to throw it at a partridge because he had no weapon at hand. At Kiskisink (P.Q.) in 1917 there were several bear's skulls hanging on a tree near the camp of an old woman hunter of the Lake St. John band. Baptiste Picard (Seven Islands) and Pitabano (Ungava) stated that this custom was the usual one in their bands. Cf. the statement of Tailhan, Blair, I, p. 132, note 99. Comeau (p. 85) refers to this custom and says the rest of the bones were burned.

⁵⁹¹ Among the Mistassini some tobacco was rolled up in a piece of birch bark and stuck in the nasal orifice of the skull or fastened to the head bones. (Information Dr. Michelson and Dr. Speck.) It was also desirable for passers-by to place a bit of tobacco in the skull of a bear that they might see hanging to a tree in the woods. Cf. Chambers, p. 315.

⁵⁹² If a man has killed a bear as the result of a dream he marks the skull with a couple of bars of red paint before lashing it to a tree (Picard, Seven Islands). Pitabano (Ungava) maintained that one bar on the forehead was proper under these circumstances.

of the animal in this characteristic manner⁵⁹³

The *Northern Sauteaux*⁵⁹⁴ also erect poles for the purpose already described in the case of the Montagnais-Naskapi. Skinner describes and figures one which was erected by a Lac Seul Sauteaux. The bark was intact on the lower portion of the pole but at three foot intervals there were peeled bands about one foot in width. These had been rubbed with red ochre.⁵⁹⁵ On it were hung, in addition to a bear's skull, the skin of the animal's muzzle and its ears, as well as offerings of tobacco and ribbons.⁵⁹⁶ Some Sauteaux claimed that the skull should be painted with charcoal,

⁵⁹³ See Chambers, p. 315; Le Jeune, p. 219. Hind, I, p. 185, says that the bones were buried; II, p. 110, quotes Pere Durocher (1853) in regard to a general taboo of this sort, the belief being that the spirits of the animals would become hostile if their bones were given to the dogs. Picard was clear in advancing this belief in regard to bears in particular. Mackenzie (p. 415) extends the taboo to the bears' flesh and says that should the taboo be broken the "vile animal is instantly slaughtered, the flesh devoured and each guest must eat a teaspoonful of his excrements, and then the bones are hung to a tree." For the Lake St. John Band it may be stated that the taboo applied to the bones of all game animals. An infringement of it would endanger luck in hunting and the normal increase of the animals hunted. Cf. Comeau p. 85.

⁵⁹⁴ Skinner (7), p. 117, sums up his observations on the custom under review as follows: "All of the northern and central Algonkians with whom the writer has come in contact, including the eastern and plains Cree, the northern, central, and plains Ojibwa, and the Bungi, Menomini, and Potawatomi have special observances connected with bear hunting. These invariably include the preservation of the skull, generally by placing it in a tree or on a pole, and usually the protection of the bones of the bear from falling the prey of village dogs."

⁵⁹⁵ Skinner (1), fig. 56. The Indian who had erected the pole refused to sell it, nor would he part with the objects hung on it "for fear that the next bear he met would attack him." Cf. Montagnais-Naskapi belief *op. cit.* The author says that "bear poles are very frequently seen on the journey from Lac Seul to Lac St. Joseph on deserted camp sites but are not found north of this" (p. 162). Long, near Lake Abitibi, saw a pole "daubed all over with vermillion paint" fairly close to a deserted camp site. He says that on the top of it "were placed three human (*sic*) skulls, and the bones hung round." This description sounds suspiciously like that of a bear pole, unless we are to accept it as a peculiarly anomalous custom not recorded by other observers.

⁵⁹⁶ Skinner (1), p. 162. Skinner believes that some of these customs may have been derived from the eastern Cree as they are most typical of the northern Sauteaux bands, according to his personal observations. While this is a distinct possibility, the wide provenience of erecting a pole or preserving the skull in a tree makes it difficult to point out the direction of diffusion of the custom with respect to any particular group. At deserted camps on Lake St. Joseph were to be seen "skulls of moose together with bears' ears, bird wings, and skulls, and moose bones hung up on trees." P. 164.

but with no other pigment. Usually it was not painted at all.⁵⁹⁷ Dogs are never allowed to get at bear bones.⁵⁹⁸

The customs of the eastern Cree,⁵⁹⁹ Tête de Boule,^{599a} Timagami Ojibway,⁶⁰⁰ and Timiskaming Algonquin,⁶⁰¹ are similar in their major aspects to those of peoples already described.

Among the *Plains Ojibway* (Bungi) the bones of the bear could not be thrown to the dogs but were carefully preserved, wrapped

⁵⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 162. This is one feature which, according to the author, differentiates the northern Saulteaux practices from those of the Cree.

⁵⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 163. Skinner saw moose bones given to dogs but those of beaver, mink, otter, muskrat, loon, and duck were thrown back into the water or hung out of the reach of dogs for fear of offending the "spirits" of the slain creatures. Cf. Reid, who says that a dog is never allowed to eat the flesh or gnaw the bones of a bear. If this happened the "subsequent chase of the animal would be unlucky."

⁵⁹⁹ Skinner (1), p. 70. The skull of the bear is carefully cleaned and the brains removed. It is decorated with vermilion (see fig. 37), kept in a safe place by the slayer for three to six months (cf. Mistassini, *op. cit.*), and then taken secretly and hung on a tree in the forest. On p. 69 the author states that a bear's bones "are never given away, unless the bear's flesh is served as a feast in the lodge of the slayer. In any event, they are carefully cleansed, saved, and hung up or placed on a scaffold where the dogs cannot reach them." We do not have any record of the Cree erecting poles or of the offerings of tobacco so characteristic of the Algonkians elsewhere, but the details we have are so meager that the negative evidence may not be of any significance. Franklin (p. 64) refers to the fact that the Cree hunters avoided bringing moose and deer to the post "lest the white people should give the bones to the dogs." The skin of the under lip was saved and, together with a piece of the tongue, bones, and claws, kept by the hunter as talismans.

^{599a} The skull was hung in a tree, the other bones thrown into a river or lake to keep them out of the way of dogs. A knife was often made of the bear's thigh bone. The fore-paws were saved and used for divination. Information, D. S. Davidson.

⁶⁰⁰ Speck (1), p. 27. The skull is "painted with a black stripe from nose to occiput and another stripe perpendicular to this across the crown; a black spot in each quarter. Then a spruce tree is trimmed of bark, but left standing in its natural position; the skulls are tied to the trunk, and ribbon streamers are tacked to the top of the tree and red bands painted around the peeled portion at intervals." Moose and caribou antlers were placed on a tree stump and skulls of beaver were placed in the branches of a tree near where the animal was killed. To neglect this was thought to weaken the power of a hunter.

⁶⁰¹ Speck (2), p. 26. After the bear feast "the lower jaw bone is tied to the skull in its proper position and black stripes are painted on the skull. This is then put on the stub end of a branch of a tree facing some prominent point toward the river or lake, near the water's edge. Here it can be seen by passers-by as a reminder of the place and occasion of the bear feast." Some hunters, in order to ensure success in their enterprises, "preserve the skulls of all the game they kill." P. 24.

in a bundle, and hung on a tree. The nose was often carried off into the woods and hung up in some secret place.⁶⁰² The *Plains Cree* on the other hand, do not preserve the skull of the bear, or hang it up on a tree or pole, and the bones of the animal are not kept away from the dogs.⁶⁰³

South of the Great Lakes the *Menomini* and *Forest Potawatomi* are the only Algonkian people from whom we have information on the points under review. It is, perhaps, indicative of the ancient character of these customs that despite the more sedentary emphasis in their economic life, as contrasted with their northern congeners, they retain a reverential attitude toward the bear and several of the characteristic practices found in the north are known to them. Among the Menomini the skull and lower jaw of a bear are tied together⁶⁰⁴ and broken cedar twigs are thrust into the nostrils. It is hung up in a sacred place in the slayer's lodge for a time and later hung on a tree in a "clear place" in the forest.⁶⁰⁵ The other bones must not be broken and should be kept away from dogs. They are wrapped up, some tobacco tied with them, and then they are thrown into the river.⁶⁰⁶ The Potawatomi exhibit a variant custom. They preserve the shoulder blades as well as the skull, but apparently do not hang them up on trees or poles.⁶⁰⁷

⁶⁰² Skinner (4), p. 510. Particular mention is not made of the skull.

⁶⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 541. Jacob Bear (an eastern Cree) told Skinner that the practices of the plains people, among whom he was then living, were entirely at variance with his father's habits. The "bell" pendant of a moose, however, is hung on a tree nearby after the animal is killed, "as an offering to the gods." (sic)

⁶⁰⁴ Cf. Timiskaming Algonquin, *op. cit.*

⁶⁰⁵ Skinner (3), p. 213; also (5), p. 179. The brains are removed through a hole made in the right temple. Cf. Gold, note 620.

⁶⁰⁶ Skinner (3), p. 213. In winter a hole is chopped in the ice. "The reason for this custom is the belief that the bear will come to life again and return to be re-caught if all of his bones are together and well cared for." A similar explanation is given by the St. Francis Abenaki for returning beaver bones to the water. It is even said that if the bones are thrown into a lake where no beaver were before, the animals will later appear.

⁶⁰⁷ Skinner (field notes) says that they are wrapped in birch bark and placed in a little outhouse. The shoulder blades were probably used for purposes of divination. See Speck (9).

Mackenzie Area

Although we have so little specific information of a sound ethnological character for the various Athabascan tribes of this area, we may perhaps accept the generalization made by Father Morice regarding the treatment of bears' skulls among the Déné known to him. He writes, " . . . they put the bear's head out of the reach of dogs or wolves, unclean animals with which contact is defiling, and therefore, humiliating for the whole bear gens, which would not fail thereafter to avoid giving the careless hunter another opportunity of allowing such unbecoming treatment."⁶⁰⁸ In another place he states clearly that among the Carrier, the skull is "invariably stuck up on a stick or the broken branch of a tree."⁶⁰⁹ Among the Ten'a neither the bones nor the flesh of a bear must be given to dogs, but apparently it is not customary to hang up the skull.⁶¹⁰

⁶⁰⁸ The occasion for the statement of Morice is instructive. He is pointing out this custom as a parallel to the practices of the Siberian natives, a fact which he says "all travelers in Asia and America have noticed." See Morice (4), pp. 171-2. Cf. (5), p. 129. The Tahltan of the Stikine River burn the skulls of bears and seldom place them on poles. "Farther east among other Tahltan and among the Kaska they are generally placed on poles or in trees." (Information Mr. Jenness from notes of J. Teit.)

⁶⁰⁹ The author adds here that the natives give no reason for the practice, but in the quotation cited above he seems to have cleared up the point for himself. Marten and beaver also must be kept away from dogs. Morice (2), p. 108.

⁶¹⁰ Jette (2), p. 605, gives only the briefest reference to the matter. They may not be thrown away carelessly or put into any dirty place. He specifically mentions burning them or throwing them into the river, adding that during the winter "the water hole from which the daily supply of water is obtained is almost filled with these bones." There is no doubt regarding the prevalence of the idea among the Athabascan tribes that dogs contaminate game animals by contact. See, e.g., Pike, p. 56, who writes that caribou bones among the Yellow Knives and Dog Rib are sometimes put up in a tree; Harmon, p. 314 (beaver bones); Hearne, p. 307; Dall, p. 89, for Tinneh of Alaska, with special reference to beavers and sables; Morice (2), p. 108, for the same animals among the Carrier, also the anecdote told by the author in his *Au pays de l'Ours Noir* (1897), p. 71, quoted by Frazer, p. 239.

Plateau

Among the Thompson River Indians,⁶¹¹ the Lillooet,⁶¹² Shuswap,⁶¹³ and Chilcotin⁶¹⁴ it was customary to elevate bears' skulls on poles or trees. While we find it recorded for these tribes that the bones of certain game animals must be kept away from dogs, and it would appear to be a fairly general concept among them, the bear is not specifically mentioned in this connection.⁶¹⁵ It seems inconceivable, however, that this animal should escape the application of this ideology in view of the practices referred to.

EURASIA

That the custom we have been considering prevailed over a considerable portion of Siberia is not to be doubted, although the evidence we have been able to collect for this region is scattered and the details we were able to assemble in the case of some of the American aborigines, unfortunately, are lacking. The preservation of bear skulls and the practice of placing them in the woods, on trees, or in some special place, has been reported for the following peoples: Kamchadal,⁶¹⁶ Yukaghir,⁶¹⁷ Yakut,⁶¹⁸ Manyarg,⁶¹⁹

⁶¹¹ Teit (4), p. 347, says that when the flesh of a bear's head had been eaten, the skull was tied to a small tree top, as high as could be reached, and left there. The men who put it there always painted their faces in a certain way. It was considered a mark of respect to carry out this custom. If it were not done bears might take offense and the hunter would be unable to kill any more of them. Deer's heads (p. 346) were sometimes placed on trees so as to be beyond contaminating influences, particularly of women and dogs.

⁶¹² Teit (1), p. 279. "The hunters (after address) painted both sides of their faces black, and, after butchering the bear, raised its head on the top of a pole, or hung it to the branch of a tree. Some hunters threw it in the water. Thus the bears would be pleased, and would neither seek revenge nor give bad luck to the hunters."

⁶¹³ Teit (2), p. 603. The skulls were "raised on the tops of tall poles."

⁶¹⁴ Teit (3), p. 789. "Invariably elevated on poles."

⁶¹⁵ See Teit (4), p. 346, for the Thompson's method of safeguarding deer bones: the Lillooet (Teit [1], pp. 281-2) threw deer and beaver bones into the water for the reason cited; Shuswap (Teit [2], p. 603) regarding deer and beaver; Boas (5), p. 642, reported for the same people that beaver bones were thrown in the river. Dogs were not allowed to gnaw or to eat beaver meat.

⁶¹⁶ Steller, p. 117, writes that they hung the skull and haunches (Hüften) either under the rafters of their houses or outside of their dwellings upon trees. Krashennikoff, p. 103, refers only to the former practice.

⁶¹⁷ Jochelson (4) refers to the fact that the skull and other bones are put on a platform in a special hut. Inside of the skull are put shavings. While doing this the

Gold,⁶²⁰ Gilyak,⁶²¹ Oltscha,⁶²² Ainu,⁶²³ Tungus (Northern),⁶²⁴

natives say, "Your brain we put in now." A piece of wood is also put in which represents the tongue. This treatment of the remains is for the purpose of keeping the skeletal parts out of the way of dogs and is done in the case of elk and deer, also. It is believed that if the bones of the animal are assembled it will come to life again. Jochelson (2), p. 148.

⁶¹⁸ The bones are collected, wrapped in birch bark, and hung on a tree (Galitzin). Middendorf, IV, p. 1609, writes that the skulls are hung up on trees to keep them out of the way of dogs.

⁶¹⁹ Atkinson, p. 369. "In their encounters with the bear they are careful not to injure his head, as they offer it to their god (sic) and it must be without blemish, enclosed in birch bark and suspended from a tree: this they believe to be a certain antidote against evil spirits."

⁶²⁰ Lansdell, II, p. 233, note, refers, to the interior of a house in which bear skulls and bones adorned the walls. Von Schrenck (pp. 730-1). Bear skulls are hung to the branches of trees. They do not split the skull, as the Gilyak do, although the ones he examined each had a large perforation in one side or the other through which the brain had been removed. Other bones of the animal are hung up, too, instead of being buried as among the Gilyak.

⁶²¹ Bush, p. 124, writes that "upon all sides, scattered through the woods, were skulls of bears poised upon the stumps of small trees, from four to six feet above the ground." He calls these offerings, and then adds that when newly placed in position they were "sprinkled with tobacco, berries, roots, and other articles." Lansdell, II, p. 233 (note), says the ears, jaw bones, skull, and paws are hung on trees, "Occasionally, the skull is split and suspended in their houses." Cf. Von Schrenck, pp. 730-1. The skulls of bears killed in their festivals are split by a special instrument (see plate 51, fig. 5), a proceeding which strangers are not allowed to witness. After the brain is removed the skull and bones are taken out of the house with a great deal of ceremony by the older people and carried to the forest. All of the bones except the skull are buried. The latter is wedged into a cleft made in the stump of a young tree felled near the ground. Sternberg (1), p. 271, says the head and bones are "in das traditionelle Gebäude fortgebracht, das zur Grabstätte der Reliquien das heiligen Tieres dient." The Gilyak of Saghalin (Hawes p. 202) take the skulls of bears into the unfrequented parts of the woods and place them on sticks. Scheube, quoting an observer named Joest (p. 236), says the skull is placed with shavings (*inao*?) in a tree near the house. Labbé, p. 267, writes that the skull is temporarily placed in a little store-house used for fish and later carried to the edge of the forest.

⁶²² Von Schrenck, p. 731. The Oltscha customs are the same as those of the Gilyak.

⁶²³ The *nusa* or "sacred hedge" is the special depository for the skulls of bears killed in the chase as well as those sacrificed at Ainu festivals. Batchelor, p. 494, writes that a "tall pole is here set up having a fork in the top; the prongs of which are ornamented with *inao*." It is called *keomande-ni*, i.e., "the pole for sending away"; see Fig. 495, and, for a sketch of a *nusa*, p. 90. This author saw a collection of two hundred such skulls outside of one hut. They are called *akoshiratki kamui* (divine preservers), and libations and offerings are made to them, from time to time. Cf. Von Siebold,

Samoyed,⁶²⁵ Ostyak.⁶²⁶ Among the Yukaghir and Yakut our authorities state that the natives maintain that this is done in order to keep the bones from the dogs. Inquiry would no doubt reveal a similar notion in other cases.

COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION OF POST-MORTEM OBSERVANCES

The multiformity of the post-mortem customs connected with bears has been sufficiently brought out in the foregoing regional survey of the concrete data and needs no further comment at this point. Yet, in spite of the wide differences in these customs and the variations which occur even within the bounds of the areas where similarities predominate, one is also impressed with certain intercontinental correspondences, the character of which we shall now discuss.

1. Throughout the regions of both continents where ceremonies are performed after killing a bear, there seems to be an *underlying trend* in the customs described, despite much variation in detail. I refer to the conciliatory spirit in which they are carried out. No matter whether the observances themselves are simple or elaborate, their purpose seems to consistently imply an ostensible

pp. 18, 26; Scheube, p. 234; Landor, pp. 214, 282, 286, and illustration, p. 281; Bird II, p. 99; Von Brandt, p. 134; Hitchcock, pp. 472, 476; sketch p. 481 and plate cxii; Labbé, p. 257.

The skulls of certain other animals are sometimes similarly treated, e.g., foxes (Scheube, p. 234); (Landor, p. 214) wolves (*ibid.*, p. 214) and deer (p. 286). Fox skulls are usually kept in the huts. See Batchelor, pp. 352-4, 505, and Von Brandt, *op. cit.*

⁶²⁴ Czaplicka (1). "The bones of the bear must be placed just as they are in a bag, and hung on a tree. If one bone is lost, the spirit of the bear will hold the hunter responsible for it."

⁶²⁵ Jackson speaks of the sacrificial piles of the Samoyed (one of them on the island of Waigatz is figured on p. 34 of the author's *Great Frozen Land*) which he says are "rude heaps of sticks, antlers and bones. They all contain bear skulls as well as those of other animals. Sometimes the skulls are stuck upon the so-called "*bolvan*" (erect posts with the end roughly carved to represent a human face). They are sacred and even though surrounded by driftwood a Samoyed will never take a piece from here. It may be worth mentioning that, although there is no reference to bear's bones, some of the Samoyedic peoples (see Middendorf, p. 1447) consider it a sin for a dog to gnaw the bones of the wild reindeer.

⁶²⁶ Gondatti, p. 77, says that at the end of the period of celebration the skull is hung on a tree in the belief that this honors the bear and it will therefore bring good luck to those participating. The claws and canine teeth are also preserved.

demonstration of respect toward the bear. In the cases where we were able to throw any light whatsoever upon the actual motivation of the ceremonies, in terms consistent with native thought, this interpretation was amply demonstrated. The bear was believed to represent, or was under the spiritual control of, some supernatural being or power which governed either the potential supply of certain game animals, or the bear species alone. It is the propitiation of this supernatural agent which is actually desired and not the animal itself, conceived simply as a terrestrial creature. The bear veneration of these peoples is not "animal worship" in a crude or narrow sense, therefore, unless we mean by this term the propitiation of the supernatural controller of the bear. In some of the tribes surveyed, in fact, this would amount to the worship of an independent deity. But, it is necessary to perform the established ceremonies, whatever terms we may prefer for them, in order that more bears or other animals may be released by the spiritual controller of the bears. In this way man is able to advance his own material welfare.

The ceremonies performed by the Pueblo Indians of North America do not, as far as I can see, manifest the trend described above. The treatment of the bear as a *slain enemy* would be just as foreign to the Lapps as to the Algonkians of the Eastern Woodlands of America, or to the Siberian peoples. The northern peoples, however widely separated, show a fundamental similarity in this respect, therefore, which the peoples of the Southwest, although exhibiting certain external analogies, fail to exhibit. Altogether, their treatment of the bear seems more aberrant, compared with all of the northern peoples discussed, than do the geographically most remote of the latter in respect to each other.

2. In addition to the underlying trend which characterizes the bear ceremonies of both continents, there are basic analogies in the character of the observances themselves, which, with few exceptions, are also intercontinental in their distribution. The most widespread and important of these are the following:

- a The rites are always performed after the animal is killed and in connection with eating it.⁶²⁷

⁶²⁷ Aside from differences in the motivation and ideology of the Ute and Kutenai observances, the mere fact that the occasion of the ceremonies which they perform is

- b* The carcass of the animal, its head, or its head and skin, is the special focus of ceremonial attention.
- c* Offerings are made to the bear (or its supernatural controller). If food, it is placed before the animal; if in the form of objects, they are placed on the head, carcass, or skin. There seems also to be a decorative side to this custom in some cases, that is, an effort to "dress up" the creature in borrowed finery.
- d* There are prescriptions and taboos in connection with eating the bear in which sexual differences are emphasized. Certain parts are usually taboo to women, it being a male prerogative to eat them.
- e* The ceremonies are usually part of a communal feast, or celebration, an event of some social importance, to which friends and neighbors are bidden.

3. Although very few in number and extremely scattered in distribution, specific correspondences in the post-mortem customs connected with the bear are not entirely lacking. We shall simply mention in summary form those which occur in both North America and Eurasia:

- a* The special disposition of the skull of the bear is the most widespread of these, together with the explanation that it is done in order that the dogs may not defile the bones of the beast.
- b* In skinning a bear the hide is slit from the throat downwards (Lake St. John Montagnais, Mistassini, Penobscot, Tête de Boule, Gilyak.⁶²⁸)
- c* Reference is made to stuffing the skin of a bear by one of

dissociated from the actual killing of the bear itself, serves to place them in a category entirely apart from the observances of the majority of the peoples under discussion.

⁶²⁸ The significance of this custom among the Indians lies in the fact that this procedure is followed *only* in the case of the bear. Whether this is true of the Gilyak is not stated. The lack of details regarding the skinning of the bear in the case of other peoples studied makes it impossible to interpret the significance of the parallel with any satisfaction, but this case illustrates the potential importance which may be latent in apparently insignificant details of culture.

the earliest writers on the Montagnais-Naskapi and this is also done by the Koryak and Ostyak.

- d* The carcass of the bear or certain other parts of the animal are not introduced into a dwelling by the door but through some other opening (Mimac, Ainu, Gilyak, Lapps).⁶²⁹
- e* Women are forbidden to look at the dead bear (Mistassini, Ostyak) or are required to leave the dwelling into which it is taken (Montagnais, Micmac, Finns).
- f* The feast of the bear's meat is characterized by the "eat all" feature (Montagnais, Eastern Cree, Tête de Boule, Ainu, Asiatic Eskimo (head), Lamut, Lapps).
- g* The men eat the heart of the bear (Northern Saulteaux, Gilyak, Northern Tungus, Ostyak, Vogul, Lapps).
- h* The offering of food made to the bear is not characteristic of the Algonkian ceremonies⁶³⁰ but connects the Nootka and Kwakiutl of the northwest coast of America with the Asiatic Eskimo, Koryak, Kamchadal, Gilyak, and Ainu, all of whom lay considerable emphasis upon this practice.

⁶²⁹ This custom, although not always associated with the bear, is one which is clearly of wide provenience in America. Among the Eskimo (west coast of Hudson's Bay, Boas [2], p. 148) the meat and skins of caribou killed in the fall are taken into a snow house through a hole cut in the rear. Salmon among the Ukusikalirmiut are also introduced by a separate entrance (Boas [1], p. 595). In both these cases the custom is connected with the notion that land and fresh water creatures must be handled differently from those which dwell in the sea. The Carriers (Morice [2], p. 107) never bring a lynx in through the doorway. They use the smoke hole instead, as the women pass through the former, and they are forbidden any contact, no matter how remote, with this animal. When a woman returns to a Babine lodge after childbirth seclusion, animals are brought in through the smoke hole for a few days in order to remove them from any potentially bad influence which a woman in this condition may exert (Hamilton, p. 207). Deer meat was taken in through a hole in the back of a Thompson dwelling (Teit [4] p. 346) because women who are ceremonially unclean use the doorway and might therefore offend the animals. Apparently, the Lillooet (Teit [1], p. 269) followed a similar custom as it is stated that "women never passed by the back of a hunting lodge because game was taken in that way or was cached there."

⁶³⁰ Throughout the Eastern Woodlands tobacco inevitably appears as an offering in the bear ceremonies but the bear is never "fed." The food offering also disappears when we leave eastern and northeastern Siberia. It is not characteristic of the Finno-Ugrian ceremonies.

HISTORICAL DEDUCTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

We have now completed our survey of the most characteristic customs, ceremonies, and beliefs which center around the bear in North America and Eurasia. In the course of our investigation we have indicated both the similarities and differences which occur and, so far as possible, the cases in which customs associated with bears are also practiced in connection with the hunting of other animals. In regard to this latter point we may advance the conclusion that no other animal was found to attain such universal prominence as the bear, nor to have associated with it, over such a wide geographical area, such a large series of customs. Of all the game animals hunted in the north, the bear is the most constant recipient of special attention, even when, as in north-eastern Siberia, the respect evidenced toward other creatures and the ceremonial treatment rendered to them by certain peoples, equals that meted out to the bear. This fact is undoubtedly one which needs explanation, aside from the more perplexing question as to whether or not the typical ceremonies connected with the bear on both continents have any historical roots in common.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL HYPOTHESIS

As we have indicated in our introductory discussion, certain writers have advanced a psychological explanation of man's regard, reverence, or veneration for particular animals. Does this hypothesis aid us in interpreting the attitudes and practices connected with bears which have been surveyed in the course of our investigation, or does it throw any light whatsoever upon their history? Can we say, for instance, that the common characteristics exhibited by the various species of bears (to say nothing of their differences), have made a similar impression upon the human consciousness everywhere, ergo, bear veneration and ceremonial practices have inevitably arisen?

To begin with, we may admit that among the animals found in the habitat of the natives of North America and northern Eurasia, the ursine species are distinguished by characteristics which lend themselves more readily to anthropomorphization than those of other animals. Bears *do*, first of all, seem to possess

sagacious qualities. Those who have had the best opportunities to make a close study of them all remark this fact.⁶³¹ Then, too, the omnivorous habits of these creatures make them genuine competitors of man in the pursuit of food;⁶³² on occasion they raise themselves upon their hind legs in a human-like manner or sit down against a tree with their paws, like arms, at their sides and perhaps one leg drawn up under the body; their plantigrade locomotion leaves an impression in mud or sand much like human feet (a heel, arch, and toes being distinguishable),⁶³³ and their excrement is similar to that of human beings, only considerably larger.⁶³⁴ In emotional behavior the bears also exhibit a range of facial and bodily expression which is very human.⁶³⁵ When attacked the animals often whine in a pleading way and tears may even appear in their eyes.⁶³⁶ They even resemble human beings in their well known tendencies to masturbation (at least in captivity), and when skinned the human-like proportions of the beast have received repeated comment in primitive and contemporary society alike.⁶³⁷ Add to these characteristics the peculiar habit of hibernation without food—a phenomenon which must be specially curious and mystifying to the unsophisticated mind—and one can in this case read undoubted plausibility into the psychological

⁶³¹ Consult, e.g., the books of Wright and Hornaday. The latter in his 1,000 point scale of animal intelligence (p. 41) gives the grizzly a rating of 725 and the brown bear (European) one of 650. The gorilla gets only 500; the beaver 725. See also chap. XII. On p. 124 this author writes: "From sunrise to sunrise a bear is an animal of original thought and vigorous enterprise. Put a normal bear in any new situation that you please, he will try to make himself master of it."

⁶³² Hawes says (p. 168) that the Gilyak actually look upon the bear in this way.

⁶³³ See Thompson-Seton, II, pp. 1079, 1085.

⁶³⁴ *Ibid.*, II, p. 1087.

⁶³⁵ Hornaday (p. 127) writes: "Next to the apes and monkeys, I regard bears as the most demonstrative of all wild animals. The average bear is proficient in the art of expression." Also *passim*.

⁶³⁶ See Sternberg's realistic account of the behavior of the animal when shot ([1] p. 267).

⁶³⁷ The Montagnais-Naskapi point this out and the Eskimo taboo on bear meat mentioned by Boas (2), pp. 148, 489, is evidently based upon the same observation. The Chukchi (Bogoras 325) also say that a skinned bear closely resembles a man. Cf. Sternberg's vivid description of the carcass of a bear in terms of Gilyak psychology ([1], pp. 267-8).

hypothesis. Such traits as these are surely of a type which, conceivably, might lead directly to an anthropomorphic conceptualization of the species.⁶³⁸ Having compelled human interest, the human qualities of bears may have also aroused awe, wonder, fear or some other emotional response which, in turn, gave rise to an attitude of veneration and propitiatory observances. Thus might run the psychological interpretation.⁶³⁹

Aside from the question of ultimate origins, regarding which one guess is as good as another, do the data assembled support or contradict this thesis? The essential question is whether the "human traits" of the bear can be said to be related causally to bear veneration, or other customs, as they actually exist in the tribes surveyed. I think not, particularly if we weigh against this interpretation certain other important considerations.

1. Whereas the "human traits" of the bear are readily observable to anyone, the attitude of veneration by no means coincides with the geographical distribution of the species. It has a very much narrower provenience.

2. Even though it can be stated as a generalization that this attitude is common to many peoples, it would be incorrect to maintain that we have here anything like a uniform concept. Not only does veneration differ in degree, but in point of uniqueness,

⁶³⁸ That this has actually occurred is not to be doubted but it must be kept in mind that anthropomorphic traits have also been attributed to many other animals. For explicit statements regarding the anthropomorphization of the bear, see e.g., Kohl, pp. 408-9; Copway, p. 30 (Ojibway); Schultz, p. 106 (Blackfoot); Skinner (1) p. 76 (E. Cree); Krause, p. 181 (Tlingit); Bogoras, p. 325 (Chukchi, Lamut, Yukaghir); Sternberg (1), p. 248; Von Schrenck, p. 696; Hawes, p. 168 (Gilyak). The last, e.g., writes, "The natives are fully aware of the Ch'uffs' (bears) cunning and regard him almost as a Gilyak, certainly as a competitor, and love to tell stories of his knowing ways. They describe how he will go a-fishing, by preference at night, but if by day, he will stand with his right paw held close to his heart lest the sun should cast a shadow on the water and frighten the fish; how he will get up on his hind legs to fight and parry a spear-thrust, or shield his heart from a shot with his paw."

⁶³⁹ This type of explanation for bear veneration is illustrated for specific peoples by such remarks as the following: "There is no doubt that this wild beast inspires more of the feeling which prompts worship than the inanimate forces of nature and the Ainu may be distinguished as bear-worshippers," "... the bear, which is the strongest, fiercest, and most courageous animal known to them, has probably in all ages inspired them with veneration." Bird, II, p. 99. Cf. Von Schrenck, p. 696.

as compared with the attitudes manifested toward other animals. Certainly among the Gilyak and Ainu, for example, there is no other animal which is more highly revered, but even in these groups it is not the only animal toward which a venerative attitude is held.⁶⁴⁰ In other northeastern Siberian tribes the attitude toward the bear is probably even less distinctive.⁶⁴¹ In North America, on the other hand, among the Algonkians of the northern and northeastern Woodlands the veneration of the bear is much more unique⁶⁴² in character. Such facts are difficult to explain if the qualities exhibited by the bear are the sole stimulus to the development of a venerative attitude.

3. There seems to be no striking correlation between the occurrence or complexity of rites or customs and bear veneration. Even in tribes, for example, which observe no special ceremonies when a bear is killed and eaten, the animal may, nevertheless, be greatly respected or even revered.⁶⁴³ Or, where very few or simple ceremonies are practiced, the animal may be held in just as great or greater esteem as in tribes where elaborate ceremonies exist.⁶⁴⁴ Rites and customs connected with bears thus seem to be less widely spread than the veneration of the animal and we cannot make any satisfactory inference regarding one phenomenon from the presence of the other.

4. When we consider the special form which rites and customs take, the inadequacy of the psychological hypothesis becomes still more apparent. While a few observances connected with the

⁶⁴⁰ See Sternberg's remarks about the narwhal (1), p. 250.

⁶⁴¹ Among the Kamchadal, e.g., Steller, p. 276, equates the whale, bear, wolf, and narwhal as especially venerated animals. For the Koryak the whale may be mentioned, for the Reindeer Chukchi, the wolverene and elk.

⁶⁴² For Montagnais-Naskapi, see Chambers, p. 316 and MS notes of F. G. Speck; Wabanaki tribes, field notes, F. G. Speck and A.I.H. Timagami Ojibway, Speck (1), p. 27; Ojibway. Kohl, p. 408; E. Cree, Skinner (1), p. 68; N. Saulteaux, *ibid.*, p. 162, Jes. Rel., LVI, p. 127 ("it passes belief what veneration they have for the Bear").

⁶⁴³ This is certainly the case among the plains Indians and for the Mongolic tribes of Central Asia. Czaplicka (9), p. 31, writes: "Generally speaking, there is no animal worship, but some animals are venerated. The greatest veneration is shown to the bear, occasionally to the wolf, and of birds, to the eagle, the hawk, and the goose." The Samoyed might be cited as an additional example.

⁶⁴⁴ Compare, e.g., the Labrador Algonkians with the Ainu.

animal extend over considerable areas, coinciding with the veneration of the beast, other practices are specifically localized.⁶⁴⁵

Furthermore, as in the case of the venerative attitude, we discover that the practices connected with the bear apply to the treatment of other animals also, in a number of tribes.⁶⁴⁶

THE ECONOMIC HYPOTHESIS

Another hypothesis we must consider is the economic interpretation of the beliefs and customs centering around the bear. This theory, in the form of a generalized explanation of religious attitudes and practices connected with animals, has been advanced by some writers on primitive religion. N. W. Thomas, in particular, maintains that the propitiation of animals is in proportion to their usefulness.⁶⁴⁷ Is there any validity to this hypothesis as applied in the case of the bear? For the following reasons it has, to my mind, even less to recommend it than the psychological interpretation.

1. The bear is an animal of economic importance over a much wider area than that in which veneration or ritual observances occur. This applies to both continents so that, broadly speaking, the mere fact of usefulness does not in any way seem to imply the existence of correlated beliefs and customs of a magico-religious type.⁶⁴⁸

2. In the regions where the most characteristic beliefs and ceremonies connected with bears do occur, the beast is by no means the most important animal from an economic standpoint. The bear is, indeed, more often than not, clearly superseded in economic value by creatures of greater usefulness. Take, for example, the reindeer (caribou). Whether hunted, as in North America and Eurasia, or domesticated as in the region of reindeer nomadism in the latter continent, it is infinitely more basic to the

⁶⁴⁵ The use of the *nimaban* in Labrador, e.g., as compared with the widespread conciliatory address to the animal and the treatment of the skull.

⁶⁴⁶ See the ceremonies of the Asiatic Eskimo, Chukchi, Koryak.

⁶⁴⁷ See "The Origin of Concepts relating to animals."

⁶⁴⁸ Batchelor (2), however, says the Ainu worship bears (a) because they know of no more powerful or greater animal; (b) because "it is at once both food and clothing." The utilitarian aspect he would evidently consider primary, as he adds that foxes and moles are called *kamui* but are not worshipped "because they are not useful."

economy of these northern forest-tundra peoples than the bear. In northeastern Siberia and on the Northwest Coast of America, the sea mammals take first place, together with halibut and salmon in the latter region. In northeastern America the beaver even rivals the caribou in economic importace.

3. A still more contradictory fact, from the standpoint of the economic hypothesis, is that these animals which transcend the bear in economic value are not by any means universally the focus of special propitiatory ceremonies. The absence of any such rites in connection with the caribou, except in some parts of northeastern Siberia,⁶⁴⁹ is a fact which Czaplicka has commented upon.⁶⁵⁰ The same thing is true of the beaver. On the other hand, the whale⁶⁵¹ and the salmon⁶⁵² are the center of a ceremonial complex in some regions.

HISTORICO-GEOGRAPHICAL INTERPRETATION

Those addicted to psychological or economic theories of interpretation err, it seems to me, in two directions. In the first place the geographical distribution of the phenomena in question is not taken into account. In the second place, they fail to stress the chief factor in the determination of the specific attitudes and practices which prevail in any given group, viz., historic tradition or culture. The form which customs connected with bears take, as well as the presence or absence of veneration, is primarily a cultural phenomenon and requires interpretation from a historico-geographical point of view. Consequently, the characteristic attitudes and practices associated with the animal in any tribe may be said to be a function of its historical relationships and not due to any naïve observation of the traits of the species, or necessarily connected with the creature's "usefulness." Neither the psychological nor the economic hypothesis, for example, throw any light whatsoever upon the reason why the Ainu celebrate bear festivals while the Chukchi have very simple ceremonies. When we

⁶⁴⁹ Notably among the Reindeer Chukchi.

⁶⁵⁰ (4), p. 495.

⁶⁵¹ In northeastern Siberia and on the North Pacific Coast of America.

⁶⁵² On the North Pacific Coast.

observe, however, that the Amur-Gulf of Tartary region is one in which peoples geographically contiguous to the Ainu also hold periodic festivals, whereas the neighbors of the Chukchi practice only simple ceremonies, we have at least a starting point from which to advance to a more intelligible historical interpretation of the customs of the two peoples in question.

Having cut ourselves loose, therefore, from psychological and economic theories of interpretation, we may attack the problem of bear ceremonialism in its broadest intercontinental aspects from the historico-geographical standpoint.

One outstanding geographical fact is apparent in the distribution of the most typical and widespread customs associated with the bear. In the discussion of almost every topic it was found that the items which showed the most marked correspondences and, in some cases, specific resemblances to each other, had practically the same provenience. With the exception of northeastern Siberia and the Northwest Coast of America, they were found to chiefly characterize the northern Boreal hunting peoples of both continents and not those of the arctic littoral to the north or tribes of a more southerly habitat. In particular, the outstanding customs which are associated with the bear throughout this vast region include *the performance of post-mortem rites and the disposal of the skull of the animal in a conventional way, conciliatory addresses, a varied synonymy for the bear usually accompanied by a specific taboo upon the use of the generic term, the belief that the animal sucks its paws for nourishment during hibernation, and the use of thrusting and striking weapons at close quarters in the hunt. On the subjective side the idea seems to be widely prevalent that the bear is under the guidance of some sort of spiritual controller.* The seeking out of the animal in its winter den is of wider provenience, as is an attitude of respect or veneration for the bear.

In North America the northern and northeastern Algonkians exhibit all of these characteristic traits and, as I see it, resemble the peoples of Eurasia more closely than do most of the tribes of western America which exhibit fewer parallels from a quantitative standpoint.

The Plateau tribes do not, for example, perform any rites in connection with the carcass of a bear, although they treat the skull in a manner which is paralleled elsewhere. Their bear songs are conciliatory but do not resemble the Asiatic speeches to the animal as much as do those of the Algonkians; their synonymy is very weak and apparently of much less importance, if not essentially different in character. In respect to the belief in paw sucking, our information is tenuous and it is not possible to speak of their manner of hunting bears with much certainty.

On the North Pacific Coast we do find authentic traces of post-mortem rites but regarding the other, often associated, practices, a doubtful negative must be stated, although inquiry might still supplement the present record. The same situation prevails with respect to Californian data and in the Pueblo region the ceremonies which are performed are so redolent with the ideology of this area that they seem remote from the practices of the north.

In Asia, on the other hand, we find the characteristic series of customs in question appearing in northeastern Siberia, the Amur-Gulf of Tartary region, and western Siberia.⁶⁵³ In Europe the ancient Finns⁶⁵⁴ manifest the bear complex most typically, the Lapps being more aberrant in that their post-mortem treatment of the bear approaches the unique. They bury the bones of the animal and their speeches and songs to the bear, while conciliatory, are not so clearly of an Asiatic pattern. They do have a distinctive synonymy for the bear, nevertheless, and believe the animal sucks its paws during hibernation.

With the exception of the Mackenzie area in North America⁶⁵⁵ and Central Siberia in Asia⁶⁵⁶ we have, therefore, a fairly continuous distribution of a series of customs exhibiting basic analogies

⁶⁵³ The belief in paw sucking is not reported from any people of this region so far as I can discover.

⁶⁵⁴ With the exception of the paw sucking notion. While not specifically reported for the Finns the statements made with particular reference to the Lapps may, as we have already pointed out, refer to other north European peoples.

⁶⁵⁵ Here we do have some slight indications of a bear cult.

⁶⁵⁶ A region which needs investigation not only because the published data are so scanty but because it has been the scene of so many eruptive population movements from central Asia.

and some specific correspondences connected with the same animal, and including in their reach northeastern America on the one hand and northern Europe on the other. Does this fact give us any clue whatsoever to the solution of the fundamental historical question which now confronts us? Do the resemblances in customs and beliefs connected with the bear in Eurasia and North America represent the result of convergent, but historically distinct, developments, or is there any reason to believe that they may have originally sprung from common historical roots? My own inclination is toward the latter interpretation, chiefly for the reason that the peculiar customs we have been investigating have, roughly, the same intercontinental distribution as certain other culture traits which are undoubtedly of considerable antiquity on both continents. Let us briefly review these latter traits before stating our final conclusions with respect to bear ceremonialism.

On the economic side, dependence upon the caribou is the outstanding cultural fact. Referring to North America Wissler writes ⁶⁵⁷ that "if other phases of culture were ignored, we should take the caribou range as one culture area."⁶⁵⁸ He then goes on to point out that this "culture shows some indication of being continuous with the reindeer culture of the Old World. The analogous use of bark for vessels,⁶⁵⁹ the bark-covered tipi of Siberia,⁶⁶⁰ and the remarkably tipi-like tents of Lapland⁶⁶¹ and Norway may have a common origin. The tendency has been to attribute all of these similarities to the arctic⁶⁶² environment. It seems more likely that the distribution of the allied reindeer and caribou alone has

⁶⁵⁷ Boas (8); p. 118.

⁶⁵⁸ Cf. Wissler (1), map p. 8. Thompson-Seton, map 8. The range of the Woodland caribou (*Rangifer caribou*, Gmelin) more nearly corresponds with the most typical developments of the bear complex in North America.

⁶⁵⁹ "An associate of the birch bark canoe from Nova Scotia to northern Russia," writes Wissler (1), p. 55. Kroeber, however, without reference to distribution or a discussion of the point, cites the bark canoe as an indigenous American trait, (2), p. 3.

⁶⁶⁰ Buschan, pp. 320-1, clearly shows the distribution of this type of dwelling in Asia on his map. It is not characteristic of the northeastern Siberian tribes.

⁶⁶¹ The pole foundation of the Lappish tent is quite unique as compared with that of Siberian and American peoples. See Elgström, pp. 157-160; photographs, sketches, 139-142, 147.

⁶⁶² More characteristically sub-arctic.

been the chief factor and that, as such, has served as a diffuser rather than a creator of various associated traits. The suggestion is that a culture having once developed around the caribou or reindeer as the case may be, mere expansion and diffusion would tend to carry it along, thus making the animal itself the accidental carrier of the culture. The historical view conceives that the real cause for the various traits being associated lies in the fact that they were at some former time and place so associated. Traits may thus be perpetuated so long as the faunistic or other conditions permit and it may yet turn out that certain paleolithic traits of reindeer hunters in the Old World were still to be found in Canada and Siberia a few hundred years ago."

Another investigator, Hatt, has attempted to depict in more detail an ancient intercontinental culture similar in extent to that suggested by Wissler. Hatt calls it the "*inland culture*" in contrast with the "*coast (Arctic) culture*" which he believes is still older.⁶⁶³ The former "is found fullest and most unmixed in the culture of the Tungusians," he says, "although its influence is felt from Lapland to Labrador. . . . Its most valuable possession is the snow shoe, which has carried it over the greater part of the arctic." This is the device which enables the hunter to pursue the reindeer or caribou and it is the chase of this animal which "more than anything else furthered the development of the snow shoe."⁶⁶⁴ In another place this author emphasizes the intimate relation between moccasins⁶⁶⁵ and snowshoes which he believes to have been "evolved together,"⁶⁶⁶ the principal types of the former in Eurasia and North America having "sprung from a common prototype which was not a sandal."⁶⁶⁷ Hatt also at-

⁶⁶³ Hatt, pp. 248-9.

⁶⁶⁴ P. 249. "The fact that the ski never reached America and that the Old World has only quite primitive forms of the netted snow shoes, while America has highly developed forms, would indicate that the inland culture reached America at an early period. The great variety of forms of the snow shoes and moccasins, and also the diversity of local terms, bear further witness to the considerable age of the inland culture." Cf. Mason, pp. 381-408. The ski type occurs from northern Europe to the Amur. Netted shoes are reported from the Koryak, Chukchi, Yakut, and Tungus.

⁶⁶⁵ See p. 151 for the author's definition of moccasins.

⁶⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

⁶⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

tributes a "clothing complex"⁶⁶⁸ to this inland culture, a characteristic technique of skin dressing,⁶⁶⁹ cradle boards or carrying cradles for infants,⁶⁷⁰ the birch bark canoe, and the conical lodge.⁶⁷¹ To these traits may, perhaps, be added the tambourine or skin hand drum as an essential item of a shaman's equipment,⁶⁷² scapulimantia,⁶⁷³ the "soul kidnapping theory" of disease,⁶⁷⁴ game drives,⁶⁷⁵ the earth diver *motif* in folklore,⁶⁷⁶ hunting territories,⁶⁷⁷ bloody animal sacrifices.⁶⁷⁸

⁶⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 247-8. Wissler (1), p. 63, remarks the association of tailored clothing with the reindeer-caribou area of Eurasia and America.

⁶⁶⁹ Hatt, p. 249. Including the use of double-handled scrapers ("originally a long bone"), smoking of the skin, and "perhaps even the use of fat as a tanning substance."

⁶⁷⁰ Cf. Mason, pp. 495-535. A bag is the corresponding device among the Labrador Indians.

⁶⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷² Lowie (5), p. 180, calls attention to the "arbitrary association of shamanistic activity with a tambourine, which links some of our eastern Indians not only with Siberia but with Lapland." Cf. Kroeber (2), p. 18.

⁶⁷³ Lowie, *op. cit.*, p. 173; Andree; Speck (9).

⁶⁷⁴ See Lowie, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-80, who suggests that this notion may be a heritage from Paleolithic man.

⁶⁷⁵ For Reindeer (caribou), deer, and buffalo. See Lowie (4) who writes (p. 282), "Altogether, I cannot escape the impression that we are here face to face with a cultural parallel which implies a single center of origin, that the impounding of game in the manner described evolved possibly in some Siberian tribe and thence spread to the east and the west. It is, indeed, a far cry from the Samoyed (Lowie has previously called attention to its use by the Lapps) to the nearest North American aborigines, but the resemblance is too great and the features too complex to permit the assumption of independent invention. Perhaps further inquiry will serve to discover traces of the custom in Western Siberia." On the basis of information furnished me by Mr. H. U. Hall (cf. Middendorff, pp. 1369, 1380.) the distribution of this method of hunting reindeer in Siberia can be advanced to the Yenisei River where the Samoyed, of the Big Low Tundra, employed it. Cf. Wissler (2), pp. 21-2, where the suggestion is made that the impounding of buffalo by the Plains Tribes may have been derived from northern peoples of Eastern Woodland culture. It was also characteristic of the Athabascans, see Franklin, p. 218; Richardson, I, p. 393; II, p. 26; Emmons, p. 70.

⁶⁷⁶ Lowie (5), p. 180, refers to the "remarkable recurrence among the Chukchi, Yukaghir, Mongolic, Turkic, and Finnic tribes of the widespread North American "earth diver" motive. viz., the diving into water for mud from which the earth is created." The Koryak may be added (Jochelson [31] p. 35, and see Abercromby, p. 134 ([Folk lore Journal, 1889]) for the form of the tale among the Vogul. This tale has not been reported east of Hudson's Bay in North America.

⁶⁷⁷ Speck (4). For references to the occurrence of this feature in the Mackenzie

Other intercontinental traits (moose-hair embroidery,⁶⁷⁹ crooked knife⁶⁸⁰) which link northeastern North America with Asia might be mentioned, but these are less germane to our argument because their distribution does not extend beyond northeastern Siberia and therefore does not approximate so closely the distribution of customs associated with the bear as the features previously referred to. Probably they belong to a more recent stratum of intercontinental culture history, possibly a repercussion of American culture upon that of Asia.

Still another facet of the Asiatic-American problem concerns the relation of the culture of western and northwestern America and the North Pacific Coast area in particular,⁶⁸¹ to Asia. Some cultural features (semi-subterranean houses,⁶⁸² coiled basketry,⁶⁸³ pottery,⁶⁸⁴ mummification⁶⁸⁵) which occur in Asia and western or northwestern America skirt the north Pacific coast proper,

area and in northwestern America, see note, p. 99. To these may be added Harmon, pp. 330-1, 255; Morice (4), p. 172. For data regarding Siberian peoples see Hiekkisch, pp. 81-2, and the reference in Morice (*op. cit.*) to the remarks of John Ledyard regarding the Tungus; Erman, II, p. 328; Castrén (1), II, p. 191.

⁶⁷⁸ Dogs in America and northeast Asia, reindeer and horses in Asia. Consult the comparative data assembled by Jochelson (3), p. 90 *seq.*; Handbook, II, p. 403, and Lowie's remarks (5), p. 173. The Lapps should be included in the distribution of these practices. Pinkerton (Regnard), p. 179; (Leems,) p. 463; Scheffer, pp. 111-2.

⁶⁷⁹ Speck (3). Cf. Boas (3), p. 534.

⁶⁸⁰ Wissler (3), map.

⁶⁸¹ Recently discussed by Kroeber (2) who writes (pp. 7-8): "It is the thesis of the following pages to demonstrate that essentially northwest coast culture shares with American culture only basic universal elements presumably derived from Asia; that it lacks regularly the generic American elements that were developed on American soil and became diffused, and that what is specific in it is either a direct outgrowth on the spot from the relatively undifferentiated primitive American culture or the result of later Old World influences."

⁶⁸² Kroeber (2), p. 13, who considers this type of dwelling intrusive from Asia. Cf. Wissler (1), p. 112, who hesitates to draw any historical deductions. Waterman (p. 43) thinks an Asiatic derivation plausible. See also Jochelson (1) who in his fundamental compilation of the data argues for a historical connection between the New and Old World houses of this type.

⁶⁸³ See Wissler (1), p. 53 (map), and Kroeber (2), p. 14.

⁶⁸⁴ Wissler (1), p. 68 (map); Sapir (2).

⁶⁸⁵ See MacLeod, who maintains that it is a very recent development, pp. 146-7.

whereas others (sinew-backed bow,⁶⁸⁶ defensive armor,⁶⁸⁷ the magic flight tale⁶⁸⁸ and other mythological correspondences,⁶⁸⁹ netting tools,⁶⁹⁰ the unsought type of vision experience,⁶⁹¹ a vigesimal system of numeration,⁶⁹² cremation⁶⁹³) include the latter in their scope. The chronological relations of these various traits present a most intricate problem, as does their probable derivation. It has become well established during the past two decades, however, primarily through the investigations initiated by Boas, that the solution of these questions is not to be sought on the assumption that northwestern America has been the passive recipient of cultural emanations from Asia. Very ancient movements of population as well as the diffusion of traits in the opposite direction have exerted a profound influence upon the culture history of northeastern Siberia, a region which possesses many basic features in common with northwestern America.⁶⁹⁴

⁶⁸⁶ Wissler (4), map, p. 132, and pp. 131-3, who argues for its Asiatic origin and latter diffusion into America. Cf. Kroeber (2), p. 6. The latter calls attention to the fact (p. 18) that it is "uncharacteristic of most of the northwest coast."

⁶⁸⁷ Wissler (1), p. 131; Kroeber, *op. cit.*, p. 6. References to the earlier detailed studies of Hough and Laufer are cited by Wissler.

⁶⁸⁸ Kroeber, *op. cit.*, p. 6, and (3), map, p. 201.

⁶⁸⁹ Limited more exclusively to northwestern America and northeastern Asia. Dixon (1), summing up this evidence, writes: "Here the degree of similarity is most striking, the myths . . . forming practically one great group . . . which are allied not by form alone, but by actual content of the myths themselves." Cf. the fundamental studies of Bogoras (1) and Jochelson (5),

⁶⁹⁰ MS, A.I.H.

⁶⁹¹ Lowie (5), pp. 180-1. Cf. Benedict, pp. 26-27.

⁶⁹² Thomas (p. 925) writes, "While the vigesimal system has not been found in use east of the Rocky Mountains, except in Greenland and among some tribes in the northwestern cis-montane portion of British Columbia, it prevailed to a considerable extent on the Pacific slope from Mexico northward to the Arctic Ocean, and it may also be added that it has been found among the eastern tribes of Siberia and was the method adopted by the Ainu." Cf. Laufer (4): Dixon and Kroeber (4).

⁶⁹³ Mac Leod.

⁶⁹⁴ Boas (3), p. 534, writes that the "fundamental features of the material culture of the fishing tribes of the coast of northeastern Asia, of northwestern America and the Arctic coast of America are so much alike that the assumption of an old unity of this culture seems justifiable, particularly since the beliefs and customs of this large continuous area show many similarities" and furthermore, "a consideration of the distribution, and the characteristics of languages and human types in America and Asia have led me to formulate the theory that the so-called Paleo-Asiatic tribes

With reference to our own problem it may be pointed out that, with a few exceptions,⁶⁹⁵ the intercontinental traits which embrace both eastern North America and western Eurasia in their distribution, are features conspicuously absent on the North Pacific coast. The chronological relation of these more widely distributed features to the Northwest Coast culture is beyond the scope of our investigation, but Kroeber's study and our own superficial survey would indicate that they belong to quite separate culture strata. If these Boreal traits, in their original form, do represent features native to an ancient Asiatic culture, later disseminated in America by migrant caribou hunters (Wissler), they may be much older than the traits common to western America and Asia or those which link the North Pacific Coast area proper with northeastern Siberia. On the other hand, it is conceivable that they may have skirted the North Pacific Coast in the course of their dissemination from the Old World, because the littoral population of this part of America was already well established and had even developed some of its unique cultural features. Consequently, it offered an infertile field for the diffusion of such traits as the conical lodge, tailored clothing, moccasins, etc., but a few other traits were adopted.

My own conclusion with respect to the history of the chief categories of customs connected with the bear is derived from a demonstration that these observances follow the same intercontinental distribution, on the whole, as the typically Boreal traits referred to. It seems probable to my mind, therefore, that in point of origin they belong to the same culture stratum. In short, I think it more than likely that a bear cult was one of the characteristic features of an ancient Boreal culture, Old World in origin and closely associated with the pursuit of the reindeer.⁶⁹⁶

of Siberia must be considered as an offshoot of the American race, which may have migrated back to the Old World after the retreat of the arctic glaciers." Cf. Boas (9), Laufer (3), p. 267; for data regarding linguistic similarities see Jochelson (6); Sternberg (5); Chamberlain (1).

⁶⁹⁵ Such as netted snow shoes, the tambourine, carrying cradles for infants.

⁶⁹⁶ It is not impossible that it may even have been derived from some Paleolithic people. However this may be, Bächler has interpreted the peculiar disposal of cave bear skulls and long bones in stone cists as evidence of an ancient bear cult at Drachen-

Later, it became intercontinental in its scope, extending from Labrador to Lapland. As this culture spread, due perhaps to the necessity of following the migrations of the animal which was the chief source of subsistence, its original traits, including a veneration of the bear and simple rites connected with hunting the animal, became more and more widely diffused and radically modified in the course of time. This hypothesis would account, it seems to me, for the ostensible differences in the customs described, as well as for the peculiar underlying trends and similarities observed. The same interpretation applies equally well to the other features of this Boreal culture complex, a point elaborated by Hatt in his study of moccasins. In certain instances I called attention to what seemed to be indications of this process of modification, differentiation, and assimilation. The bear rites of the central Algonkians were tinged with Plains influence, the Lapp bear ceremonies clearly showed their European contacts and, in the case of the Gilyak, there was an integration of the bear customs with their social organization in a fashion nowhere else to be observed. We called attention also to the similarities between the bear rites of the northeastern Siberian tribes and those performed after killing other animals. Since we find the whale and

loch. The animals were evidently eaten as the percentage of young individuals, their continuous occurrence in the deposits and the non-anatomical position of the bone remains, makes it extremely improbable that the animals died a natural death. Tools made of bear fibulae have also been found. At least one interesting analogy to the practices of living peoples is in evidence. Some of the skulls show the forehead crushed in and Bächler thinks they were probably killed by this blow. Abel has also made discoveries of what he believes to be a Paleolithic bear cult and the sculptured figure of a crude bear in clay (with a skull where the head should be) in the cavern of Montespan may perhaps be adduced as similar evidence. The early age of these discoveries is very impressive, Drachenloch, for example, being occupied in the Riss-Würm period. One may draw one's own conclusions from these facts but at least it is clear that so far as northern Eurasia and North America are concerned, the *Ursidae* were not only one of the principal groups of mammals known to man from the earliest period of human occupation in both continents, but in contradistinction to such other animals as the mammoth and rhinoceros, they were consecutively his contemporaries from that early period until today. Even the reindeer although long associated with men was not known so early as the bear. Once such a cult were started it may be argued that its conservation by northern hunters in the marginal areas of the northern hemisphere is a possibility worth consideration.

salmon ceremonially treated on the Northwest Coast of America, the problem of bear ceremonialism in these two regions needs further analysis. It may, perhaps, represent an extension of such ceremonies to the bear, or vice versa, particularly in view of the fact that we do not know the connections between the ancient Boreal culture and the cultural developments peculiar to northwest America and northeast Asia. We also have pointed out that the elaborate festivals of the Amur-Gulf of Tartary region are relatively recent in time, having probably grown up out of the simpler rites practiced. This fact basically connects these tribes with other peoples who observe such customs.

Our investigation has, then, accomplished two major aims: (1) It has brought to a focus the available data on a cult connected with a single animal, exhibiting the peculiarities in the customs and beliefs of many different peoples and widely separated regions. (2) It has enabled us to advance an historical hypothesis to account for intercontinental analogies and differences.

In accomplishing the first aim, many gaps in the data have been revealed which field investigation may even yet be able to close up. Minor problems of diffusion have also been touched upon, but these, too, need to be supplemented by information which only the specialist in a particular region can fully command. The relation of the rites and customs connected with other animals to those centering around the bear is also of interest and will throw light, perhaps, on the history of the latter series of customs in some regions. Finally, it is our hope that an intercontinental perspective in approaching certain problems in American culture history will receive increasing consideration and that more intensive regional investigations of customs connected with the bear, as well as detailed surveys of other widely distributed Boreal traits, will be undertaken. The historical interpretation which we have essayed may then receive more final confirmation or rejection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations—A.A.—American Anthropologist.

Mem, A.A.—Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association.

A.M.N.H.—American Museum of Natural History.

- Bull. A.M.—Bulletin of American Museum of Natural History.
 A.P.A.M.—Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History.
 B.A.A.S.—British Association for the Advancement of Science. Reports of Annual Meetings.
 B.B.A.E.—Bulletins-Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D.C.
 H.E.—Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.
 Indian Notes—Indian Notes and Monographs—Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York.
 J.A.F.L.—Journal of American Folk Lore.
 J.A.I.—Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.
 Jesup—Jesup North Pacific Expedition.
 N.M.—Reports, U.S. National Museum. Washington, D.C.
 R.B.A.E.—Reports, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D.C.
 U.Cal.—University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology.
 U.P.—Anthropological Publications of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania.
- Abercromby, J.—The Pre- and Proto-Historic Finns. 2 vol, London. 1898.
 Acerbi, J.—Travels through Sweden, Finland and Lapland, London. 1802.
 Ahlqvist, A.—Unter Wogulen und Ostjaken. Acta Societatis Scientiarum, Fennicae, vol. xrv, Helsingfors. (1885).
 Allen, J. A.—Report on the mammals collected in Northeastern Siberia, etc. Bull. A.M. vol. 19.
 Andree, R.—Scapulimantia. Boas Anniversary volume. N. Y. 1906.
 Atkinson, T. W.—Travels in the Regions of the Upper and Lower Amoor, N. Y. 1860.
 Bächler, Emil. Das Drachenloch . . . und seine Bedeutung als paläontologische Fundstätte und prähistorische Niederlassung aus der Altsteinzeit im Schweizerlande. St. Gallen 1921.
 Bartlett, F. C.—Psychology and Primitive Culture. N.Y. 1923.
 Barrett, S. A.—Pomo Bear Doctors. U. Cal. vol. 12, no. 11.
 Bastian, A.—Der Mensch in der Geschichte. Leipsic, 1860.
 Batchelor, J. —(1) The Ainu and their Folk Lore. London, 1901.
 (2) On the Ainu Term "Kamui." Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan, 16, pp. 17-32.
 Beddard, F. E.—Mammalia. Cambridge Natural History, vol. x (1920).
 Belden, Geo. P.—Belden the White Chief, 1872.
 Bickmore, A. S.—(1) Some Notes on the Aino. Trans. Eth. Soc. London, N. S. vol. 7 (1869).
 (2) The Ainos, or Hairy Men of Yesso. Am. Jour. Science, vol. xlv (1868), pp. 353-361.
 (3) The Ainos, or Hairy Men of Saghalien and the Kurile Islands. Ibid. pp. 361-377.
 Bird, Isabella L. (Mrs. Bishop)—Unbeaten Tracks in Japan. 2 vol. N. Y. 1881.

- Blair, E. H.—The Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi Valley and Region of the Great Lakes. 2 vol. Cleveland, Ohio. 1911.
- Boas, Franz—(1) The Central Eskimo. R.B.A.E. 1888.
 (2) The Eskimo of Baffin Land and Hudson Bay. Bull. A.M. vol. 15. 1907.
 (3) Ethnological Problems in Canada. J.A.I. 1910, vol. XL. pp. 529-539
 (4) Kwakiutl of Vancouver Island. Jesup, vol. 5, 1898.
 (5) Shuswap. B.A.A.S. 1890.
 (6) The Methods of Ethnology. A.A. vol. 22, no. 4, 1920.
 (7) Tsimshian Mythology—31 B.A.E.
 (8) (Editor) Anthropology in North America.
 (9) Die Resulte der Jesup Expedition. Int. Cong. Am., Vienna, 1908.
- Bogoras, W.—(1) The Folk Lore of North-eastern Asia as Compared with that of North-western America. A.A. vol. iv, 1902.
 (2) The Chukchee. Jesup, vol. VII, 1904-1910.
 (3) Ideas of Space and Time in the Conception of Primitive Religion A.A. (N.S.) vol. 27 (1925).
- Boule, Marcellin—Fossil Men. Trans. by J. E. and J. Ritchie, Edinburgh, 1923.
- Brooks, A. de C.—A Winter in Lapland and Sweden. London, 1827.
- Buch, Max—Die Wotjäken. Stuttgart, 1882.
- Budge, W. W.—The Gods of the Egyptians. 2 vol. London, 1904.
- Burkitt, M. C.—Prehistory. Cambridge Univ. Press., 1921.
- Buschan, Georg—Illustrierte Völkerkunde. 2 vol. Stuttgart, 1923.
- Bush, R. J.—Reindeer, Dogs and Snowshoes; a Journal of Siberian Travel and Explorations Made in the Years 1865, 1866, 1867. N. Y. 1871.
- Castrén, M. Alexander—(1) Nordische Reisen und Forschungen. Petersburg, 1853. I. Reiseerinnerungen aus den Jahren, 1838-1844. II. Reiseberichte.
 (2) Vorlesungen ueber die finnische Mythologie. Petersburg, 1853.
- Cesaresco, E. M.—The Place of Animals in Human Thought. London, 1909.
- Chamberlain, A. F.—(1) The Problems of the Unity or Plurality and the Probable Place of the Origin of the American Aborigines. A.A. vol. 14, 1912, p. 50 ff.
 (2) Reply to Mr. Batchelor on the words "Kamui" and "Aino". Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan, xvi, 1888, pp. 33-38.
- Chambers, E. T.—The Ounaniche, 1896.
- Chapman, John W.—Tinneh Animism. A.A. vol. 23, 1921. pp. 298-310.
- Charlevoix, P. F. X.—Journal d'un Voyage fait par ordre du roi dans L' Amerique Septentrionale. Paris, 1744.
- Collins, P. McD.—A Voyage Down the Amoor, N. Y., 1860.
- Comparetti, D.—The Traditional Poetry of the Finns. (Authorized trans. from the Italian). 1898.
- Cook, Jas.—The three famous voyages of Capt. Jas. Cook round the World, etc. . . . together with the . . . subsequent voyage of Capt. King to Kamchatka, Japan and China.
- Copway, George—(or Kah-ge-ga-gah-bowh, Chief of the Ojibway Nation)—The traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibway Nation. London, 1850.

- Curtis, Edward S.—The North American Indian. vol. 1-11, 1907-1916.
- Czaplicka, M. A. (Miss —) (1) Tungus, H. E. vol. 12.
- (2) Ostyak, H. E. vol. 9.
- (3) Yakut, H. E. vol. 12.
- (4) Siberia, H. E. vol. 11.
- (5) Aboriginal Siberia. Oxford, 1914.
- (6) My Siberian Year. London. (no date).
- (7) Samoyed, H. E. vol. 11.
- (8) Influence of Environment upon the Religious Ideas and Practices of the Aborigines of Northern Asia. Folk Lore, March 31, 1914.
- (9) The Turks of Central Asia in History and at the Present Day. Oxford Press, 1918.
- Dall, W. H.—Alaska and its Resources. Boston, 1870.
- Dawson, George M.—(1) Report on the Queen Charlotte Islands, 1878. Geo. Survey Canada, Report of Progress for 1878-1879, Montreal, 1880.
- (2) Notes on the Indian Tribes of the Yukon District. A.R. Geo. Sur. Canada, 1887.
- Deniker, J.—Les Ghiliaks. Revue Ethnologique 2: 1883 (abstract of See-land.)
- Densmore, F.—Teton Sioux Music. 61 B.B.A.E., 1918.
- Denys, Nicholas—The Description and Natural History of the Coasts of North America (Acadia). Paris, 1672, edition of the Champlain Society, Toronto, 1908, by W. F. Ganong.
- De Smet—(1) Western Missions and Missionaries. N. Y. 1863.
- (2) Oregon Missions and Travels over the Rocky Mountains. 1845-1846 in R. G. Thwaite, Early Western Travels, vol. 29.
- Dixon, J. M.—Tsuishikari Ainos. Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan, vol. XI, 1883, pp. 39-50.
- Dixon, R.B.—(1) The Problems of the Unity or Plurality and the Probable Place of Origin of the American Aborigines. A.A.(N.S.) vol. 14, 1912, p. 59.
- (2) The Shasta. Bull. A.M. vol. 17, 1905.
- (3) The Northern Maidu. Ibid.
- (4) Dixon and Kroeber—The Numeral Systems of the Languages of California. A.A.9, pp. 663-690.
- Dobell, P.—Travels in Kamchatka and Siberia. 2 vol. London, 1830.
- Dumarest, Father Noël—Notes on Cochiti, New Mexico. Mem.A.A. vol.vi, no. 3.
- Elgström, Ossian—Karesuando Lapparna. Stockholm. 1922.
- Emmons, G. T.—The Tahltan Indians. U.P. vol. vi, no. 1.
- Erman, A.—Travels in Siberia, London, 1848, 2 vol.
- Fallaize, E. N.—Hunting and Fishing. H.E. vol. 6.
- Feathermann, A.—Social History of the Races of Mankind. Division 4. London, 1891.
- Fjellström, Per—Kort berättelse om lapparnas björnafänge samt deras dervid brukade vidskepeker. Stockholm, 1755.
- Flower, W. H. and Lydekker, R.—An Introduction to the Study of Mammals 1891.

- Franklin, Sir John—Narrative of a Journey to the Shores of the Polar Sea, in the years 1819, 20, 21 and 22. Phila. 1824.
- Fraser, E. H.—The Fish Skin Tartars. Jour. of China Branch, Royal Asiatic Soc. N.S. 26, 1891-92. Abbreviated from Russian of V. P. Margaritoff.
- Frazer, J. G.—The Golden Bough. 3rd ed. London, 1912. Part II Taboo; Part v Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild. (References cited as Frazer, refer to Part v).
- Galitzin, E.—Manners and Customs of the Yacoutes. 23 B.A.A.S. 1854.
- Georgi, J. G.—Russia, or a compact historical account of all the nations which compose that Empire. 4 vol. Trans. by W. Tooke, Sr. London, 1780.
- Gifford, E. W.—(1) Miwok Moieties. U. Cal. vol. 12, no. 4, 1916.
- (2) Clans and Moieties in Southern California. Ibid., vol. 14.
- Goldenweiser, A. A.—(1) Totemism, an analytical study. J.A.F.L. vol. xxiii.
- (2) Form and Content in Totemism. A.A.(N.S.) vol. 20, no. 3.
- (3) The Knowledge of Primitive Man. A.A.(N.S.) vol. 17, 1915.
- (4) Nature Worship. Article New Inter. Ency. vol. 16.
- (5) Four Phases of Anthropological Thought. Pub. Am. Sociological Soc. vol. xvi, 1921.
- (6) Early Civilization. N.Y. 1922.
- Gondatti, N.—The Bear-Cult among the Aborigines of North-Western Siberia (in Russian). Bull. of the Imperial Society of Friends of Natural Science, Anthropology and Ethnology. Moscow, 1888.
- Grant, Madison—The Origin and Relationship of the Larger Mammals of North America. 8th Annual Report, N. Y. Zoological Society.
- Greely, Edward—The Bear Worshippers of Yezo. Boston, 1884.
- Grinnell, G. B.—The Cheyenne Indians. 2 vol. New Haven, 1923.
- Hagar, Stansbury—A Melange of Micmac Notes. Proc. Am. Assoc. for the Advancement of Science. vol. 44, pp. 257-258.
- Hall, C. F.—Arctic Researches and Life among the Eskimaux. N.Y. 1865.
- Hall, H. U.—A Siberian Wilderness: Native Life on the Lower Yenisei. Geo. Review, Jan. 1918.
- Hamilton, Gavin—Customs of the New Caledonian Women belonging to the Nancausky Tine or Stuart's Lake Indians, Natotin Tine or Babine's, etc. J.A.I. 7, 1878.
- Handbook of American Indians. 30 B.B.A.E. (2 parts). Washington, 1907 and 1910.
- Harmon, D. W.—A Journal of Voyages and Travels in the Interior of North America. (Trail Makers Series) N.Y. 1903.
- Harrington, J. P. and Henderson, J.—Ethno-zoology of the Tewa Indians. 56 Bull. B.A.E.—Washington, 1914.
- Harrington, M. R.—Religion and Ceremonies of the Lenape. Indian Notes, 1921.
- Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.
- Hatt, Gudmund—Moccasins and their relation to Arctic Footwear. Mem. A.A. vol. iii, no. 3, 1916.
- Hawes, C. H.—In the Uttermost East. N. Y. 1904.
- Hawkes, E. W.—The Dance Festivals of the Alaskan Eskimo. U.P. vol. vi, no. 2.

- Hearne, S.—A Journey from Prince of Wales Fort in Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean. Pub. of the Champlain Soc., vol. VI, ed. by J. B. Tyrrell, Toronto, 1911.
- Hegner, R. W.—College Zoology. N.Y. 1919.
- Henderson, J.—See Harrington, J. P.
- Henry, Alexander—Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories between the years 1760 and 1776. N.Y. 1809.
- Henry, Alexander (the younger)—New Light on the Early History of the Greater Northwest. The Manuscript Journals of Alex. Henry and David Thompson, 1799-1814. Ed. with commentary by E. Coues. N.Y. 1897.
- Heye, G. G.—see Speck and Heye.
- Hiekisch, Carl.—Die Tungusen 1879.
- Hill-Tout, Charles—(1) Report on the Ethnology of the Stlatlunh of British Columbia. J.A.I. vol. 35, 1905. pp. 126-218.
 (2) Report on the Ethnology of the Stciatl of British Columbia, a coast division of the Salish stock. J.A.I. vol. 34, 1904.
 (3) Ethnological Report on the Steélis and Skaúllits tribes of the Hal-kômélem division of the Salish stock of British Columbia. J.A.I. vol. 34, 1904.
 (4) Report on the Ethnology of the Okanaken of British Columbia. J.A.I. vol. 41, 1911.
 (5) Notes on the Sk'qo'mic of British Columbia, 70 B.A.A.S. 1900.
- Hind, H. Y.—Explorations in the interior of the Labrador Peninsula. London 1863.
- Hitchcock, Romyn—The Ainos of Yezo. N.M. 1890.
- Hoffman, W. J.—The Menomini. 14 R.B.A.E.
- Holland, C.—The Ainos. J.A.I. vol. III.
- Hopkins, E. Washburn—(1) The Background of Totemism. Jour. Amer. Oriental Soc. vol. 38.
 (2) Origin and Evolution of Religion. 1923.
- Hornaday, W. T.—The Minds and Manners of Wild Animals. N.Y. 1923.
- Hose, C. and McDougall, W.—Man and Animals in Sarawak. J.A.I. 31.
- Howard, B. Douglas—Life with Trans-Siberian Savages. London, 1893.
- Ides, E. Y.—Three Years Travels from Moscow Overland to China, London, 1706.
- Jackson, F. G.—(1) Notes on the Samoyads of the Great Tundra Collected from the Journals of F. G. Jackson, with some prefatory remarks by A. Montefiore. J.A.I. vol. 24, p. 388 *seq.*
 (2) The Great Frozen Land, etc., 1895.
- James, H. E. M.—The Long White Mountain or a Journey in Manchuria. 1888.
- Jenks, A. E.—Faith as a Factor in the Economic life of the Amerind. A.A. (N.S.) vol. 2, 1900.
- Jenness, D.—The Life of the Copper Eskimo. Report of the Canadian Arctic Exp. 1913-18. vol. XII. Ottawa, 1922.
- Jesuit Relations. Ed, R. G. Thwaites.
- Jetté, J.—(1) On the Medicine Men of the Ten'a. J.A.I. 37:157-188. 1907.

- (2) On the Superstitions of the Ten'a Indians. *Anthropos* 6, 1911. pp. 95-108; 241-259; 602-615; 699-723.
- Jewitt, J. R.—A Narrative of the Adventures and Sufferings of J. R. Jewitt. 1820.
- Jochelson, W.—(1) Past and Present Subterranean Dwellings of the Tribes of Northeastern Asia and Northwestern America. *Proceedings, 15th International Congress of Americanists. Quebec, 1906 (1907)*.
(2) The Yukaghir and the Yukaghirized Tungus. *Jesup*, vol 9, N.Y. 1910.
(3) The Koryak. *Ibid*, vol. 6, N.Y. 1905-1908.
(4) Material for the Study of the Yukaghir Language and Folk Lore. *Bull. Imperial Russian Academy of Science (in Russian)*. Petrograd 1900.
(5) Über asiatische und amerikanische Elemente in den Mythen der Koriaken. *Internat. Amerikanisten Kongress. Stuttgart, 1904. vol. 1*.
(6) Essay on the Grammar of the Yukaghir Language. *Annals of N.Y. Acad. Sci.* 1905, vol. xvi, part II, pp. 97-154.
(7) Kumiss Festivals of the Yakut (Boas Anniversary Vol.) 1906.
- Jones, Rev. Peter—History of the Ojibway Indians. London, 1861.
- Jones, Wm.—Ojibway Texts Pub. American Ethnological Society.
- Kaindl, R. F.—(1) Die Huzulen. Vienna 1894.
(2) Viehzucht und Viehzauber in den Ostkarpaten. *Globus*. LXXIX. 1896.
- Kalevala, The Eng. trans. by J. M. Crawford, N. Y., 1888.
- King, I.—The Development of Religion: a study in Anthropology and Social Psychology. N.Y. 1910.
- King, R. (Dr.)—Narrative of a Journey to the Shores of the Arctic Ocean in 1833, 1834 and 1835. 2 vol. London, 1836.
- Klementz, D.—(1) Gilyak. *H.E.* 6:225.
(2) Buriat. *H.E.* 3:
- Kohl, J. G.—Kitchi-Gami, Wanderings around Lake Superior. London. 1860.
- Kohlbach, B.—Der Mythos und Kult der alten Ungarn. *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*. 2. 1899.
- Kondratowitsch, O. W.—Zur Ethnographie der Ostjaken. *Globus* LXXIV 1898.
- Krasheninnikoff—The History of Kamtschatka and the Kurilski Islands with the countries adjacent. Trans. by Jas. Grieve, M. D. Gloucester, England. 1764.
- Krause, Aurel—Die Tlinkit Indianer. Jena 1885.
- Kroeber, A. L.—(1) California Culture Provinces. *U. Calif.*, Vol. 17, No. 2.
(2) American Culture and the Northwest Coast. *A.A.* vol. 25, no 1. 1923. pp. 1-20.
(3) *Anthropology*. N.Y. 1923.
(4) See Dixon and Kroeber.
- Labbé, Paul—Un Baigne Russe, l'Isle de Sakhaline. Paris, 1903.
- LaHontan, Baron—New Voyages to North America, etc. 2 vol. Reprinted from the English edition of 1703. Ed. by R. G. Thwaites. Chicago, 1905.
- Landor, A. H. Savage—Alone with the Hairy Ainu. London, 1893.
- Lansdell, H.—Through Siberia. 2 vol. London, 1882.

- Lasch, R.—Der Eid, seine Entstehung und Beziehung zu Glaube und Brauch der Naturvölker. Stuttgart. 1908.
- Laufer, B.—(1) Decorative Art of the Amur Tribes. *Jesup* vol. 4.
(2) Die angeblichen Urvölker von Yezo und Sachalin. *Centralblatt für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*. Jena. vol. 5, 1900, pp. 321-330.
(3) Prolegomena on the history of Defensive Armor. *Anthrop. Pub. Field Mu. N.H.* vol. 13, no. 2.
(4) The Vigesimal and Decimal Systems in the Ainu Numerals. *Jour. Amer. Oriental Soc.* vol 37.
(5) The Reindeer and its Domestication. *Mem. A.A.* vol. iv, no. 2, 1917.
(6) Moccasins—critique of Hatt's paper. *A.A.* 19: 297 ff.
- Leclercq—New Relation of Gaspesia. (Original ed. Paris, 1691). Edition of Champlain Society, Toronto, 1910 by W. F. Ganong.
- Leems, Kund (see Pinkerton)—Account of the Laplanders of Finmark, their language, manners and religion. Copenhagen, 1767 in the Danish and Latin Languages.
- Lesepe, M. de—Travels in Kamtschatka during the years 1787 and 1788. Trans. from the French. London. 1790. 2 vol.
- Levy-Bruhl.—Primitive Mentality. trans by L. A. Clare 1923.
- Linnaeus—Lachesis Lapponica or a Tour in Lapland, . . . from the original Manuscript Journal of C. Linnaeus. 2 vol. in 1. London, 1811.
- Lloyd, L.—Peasant Life in Sweden. London, 1870.
- Long, John—Voyages and Travels of an Indian Interpreter and Trader. 1791. pp. 86-7.
- Lowie, R. H.—(1) Dances and Societies of the Plains Shoshone. *Anth. Papers of A.M.N.H.* vol. xi, Pt. 10.
(2) Notes on Shoshonean Ethnography. *A.P.A.M.* vol. xv, Pt. 3.
(3) Minor Ceremonies of the Crow Indians. *Ibid.* vol. xxi, Pt. 5.
(4) The Buffalo Drive and the Old-World Hunting Practice. *Natural History*, vol. 23, pp. 280-282.
(5) Primitive Religion. N.Y. 1924.
- Lubbock, J. (Lord Avebury)—Prehistoric Times, as illustrated by ancient remains and the manners and customs of modern savages. London, 1872, 2nd. ed.
- Lydekker, R.—See Flower, W. H.
- McDougall, W.—See Hose, C.
- Macalister, R. A. S.—A Textbook of European Archeology. vol. 1. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1921.
- MacCurdy, G. G.—Human Origins 2 vol. 1924.
- Mackenzie, James—Account of the Kings Posts in Labrador . . . with a Description of the Natives and a Journal of a Trip through those Countries in 1808. Pub. by Hon. L. R. Masson in *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*. Quebec, 1890.
- MacLeod, W. C.—Certain Mortuary Aspects of Northwest Coast Culture. *A.A.* vol. 27, no. 1.
- MacRitchie, David—The Ainos. *Internat. Archiv. für Ethnographie*. Supp. vol. iv, 1892.
- Marett, R. R.—The Threshold of Religion. London, 1914.

- Margaritoff, V. P.—See E. H. Fraser.
- Mason, O. T.—Primitive Travel and Transportation. N. M. 1894
- Masson, L. R.—*Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest*. 2 vol. Quebec, 1890.
- Maurault, J. A.—*Historie des Abenakis*. Quebec, 1866.
- Mechling, W. H.—Malecite Tales, Mem. 49, Anthropological Series 4. Geological Survey of Canada, 1914.
- Merriam, C. Hart—Review of the Grizzly and Big Brown Bears of North America. North American Fauna no. 41. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington, 1918.
- Middendorff, A. T.—*Sibirische Reise*—iv.
- Mikhailovskii, V. M.—Shamanism in Siberia and European Russia, being the second part of "Shamanstvo" by the above (V.P. Ethnogr. Section of the Imperial Society of Nat. Hist., Anthrop. and Ethnography Russian). Trans. by Oliver Wardrop. J.A.I. xxiv, 1894, pp. 62-100, 126-158.
- Mitras, S. C.—The Bear in Asiatic and American Ritual and Belief. Journal Anthropological Society Bombay. vii, 1907.
- Morice, A. G.—(1) The Western Dénés. Proceed. Canadian Institute, 3rd series, vol. 7 Toronto, 1890.
- (2) Notes on the Western Dénés. Transactions, Canadian Institute, vol. 4, Toronto, 1895.
- (3) The Great Déné Race. Anthropos. vol. 4, 1909; vol. 5, 1910.
- (4) Northwestern Dénés and Northeastern Asiatics. Transactions of the Royal Canadian Institute. vol. 4. Toronto, 1914.
- Morris, Margaretta—The Economic Study of Religion. Jour. Amer. Oriental Society, vol. 24, pp. 394-426.
- Müller, W. M.—Egyptian Mythology. The Mythology of All Races. vol. 12. Boston, 1918.
- Müller, T.—*Unter Tungusen und Jakuten*. Leipzig, 1882.
- Murdock, John—(1) On the Siberian Origin of some Customs of the Western Eskimo. A.A. vol. 1, 1888.
- (2) Ethnological Results of the Pt. Barrow Expedition. 9 R.B.A.E. Washington, 1892.
- Nelson, E. W. and Fuertes, L. A.—(1) The Larger North America Mammals. National Geog. Magazine. Nov. 1916.
- (2) The Eskimo about Bering Strait. 18 R.B.A.E. 1899.
- Niemojowski, Ludwik—Siberian Pictures. Ed. from the Polish by Major Szulczeuski. 2 vol. London. 1883
- "Notes on the River Amur and Adjacent Districts." Trans. from the Russian. Jour. Royal Geog. Society. vol. 28. 1858.
- Obermaier, Hugo—Fossil Man in Spain. N.Y. 1924.
- Osborn, H. F.—(1) Men of the Old Stone Age. 3rd ed. N. Y. 1918.
- (2) Age of Mammals. N.Y. 1911.
- Owen, M. A.—Folk Lore of the Musquakie Indians of North America. Pub. of the Folk Lore Society, LI. London, 1904.
- Pallas, P. S.—*Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des russischen Reichs*.

- St. Petersburg, 1771-1776. 3 vol. Eng. abridged trans. in J. Trusler—*The Habitable World Described*. London, 1790.
- Parker, A. C.—*Secret Medicine Societies of the Seneca*. A.A.(N.S.) vol. 2.
- Parsons, Elsie C.—*Notes on Ceremonialism at Laguna*. Anthro. Papers A.M.N.H. vol. xix.
- Pauly, de T.—*Description Ethnographique des Peuples de la Russie*. St. Petersburg. 1862. *Peuples de la Sibérie Orientale*.
- Perrot, N.—See Blair, E. H.
- Petroff, Ivan—*Alaska: its Population, Industries, and Resources*. 10th U.S. Census, 1880. vol. 8, pp. 123-177. Washington, 1884.
- Pike, Warburton—*The Barren Ground of Northern Canada*. N.Y. 1892.
- Pinkerton—*A General Collection of the best and most Interesting Voyages and Travels in all Parts of the World*. London, 1808.
- Powers, Stephen—*Tribes of California*. Contrib. to N. Amer. Ethnology, vol. 3.
- Radin, P.—*The Winnebago Tribe*. 37 R.B.A.E. Washington, 1923.
- Rae, E.—*The White Sea Peninsula*. 1881.
- Ravenstein, E. G.—*The Russians on the Amur*. London, 1861.
- Reed, V. Z.—*The Ute Bear Dance*. A.A. 1896, pp. 237-244.
- Regnard—See Pinkerton.
- Reid, A. P.—*Religious Beliefs of the Ojibway or Sauteux Indians*. J.A.I. vol. 3.
- Reinach, S. Apollo, 1915.
- Reuterskiöld, Edgar—*De Nordiska Lapparnas Religion*. Stockholm, 1912.
- Richardson, John—*Arctic Searching Expedition*. 2 vol. London, 1851.
- Rivers, W. H. R.—(1) *History and Ethnology*. History, July 1920 and Helps for Students of History. No. 48.
(2) *The Todas*, 1906.
- Sapir, E.—(1) *Time Perspective in Aboriginal American Culture*. Mem. 90, Anthr. Series no. 13, Geological Survey Canada. Ottawa, 1916.
(2) *A Note on Sarcee Pottery*. A.A. vol. 25, no. 2.
- Sarytschew, G.—*Account of a Voyage of Discovery to the Northeast of Siberia, etc.* Trans. in Phillips, *Modern Voyages and Travels*. London, 1806.
- de la Saussaye, P. D. C.—*Manual of the Science of Religion*. Eng. trans. by Beatrice S. Colyer-Ferguson. London, 1891.
- Scharff, R. F.—*Origin and Distribution of Life in America*. N.Y. 1912.
- Scheffer, J.—*History of Lapland*. Eng. trans. of *Laponia*, Frankfort, 1673.
- Scheube, B.—(1) *Der Bärencultus und die Bärenfeste der Ainos*.
(2) *Die Ainos*. Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens, Band III. Heft. 21-30 incl. 1880-1884, Yokohama.
- Schleiter, F.—*Religion and Culture: a critical survey of methods of approach to religious phenomena*. Columbia Univ. Press, N.Y. 1919.
- Schrenck, L. von—*Reisen und Forschungen im Amurlande in den Jahren 1854-1856*.
- Schultz, J. W.—*My Life as an Indian*, N.Y. 1907.
- Scott, H. B.—*A History of Land Mammals in the Western Hemisphere*. 1913

- Seeland—Die Ghiliaken. Eine ethnographische Skizze. Russian Review, vol. XI 1882. For abstracts see J. Deniker and Archiv für Anth. vol 26.
- Shklovsky, I. W.—In Far Northeast Siberia.
- Sieroshevski, W.—Yakuts. Abridged by W. G. Sumner from the Russian work. J.A.I. vol. 31.
- Simpson, George—Narrative of a Journey Around the World.
- Skinner, A.—(1) Notes on the Eastern Cree and Northern Saulteaux. A.P. A M. vol. IX, part 1, 1911.
- (2) Social Life and Ceremonial Bundles of the Menomini Indians A.P.A.M. vol. XIII, part 1, 1913.
- (3) Associations and Ceremonies of the Menomini Indians. Ibid. vol. XIII, part II, 1915.
- (4) Political Organization, Cults and Ceremonies of the Plains—Ojibway and Plains-Cree Indians. Ibid. vol. XI, Part VI, 1914.
- (5) Material Culture of the Menomini, Indian Notes, 1921.
- (6) Observations on the Ethnology of the Sauk Indians. Bull. of the Public Mus. of the City of Milwaukee, vol. 5, no. 1, 1923.
- (7) Exploration of Aboriginal Sites at Throgs Neck and Clasons Pt., N.Y. City. Contributions, Mus. of the Amer. Indian, vol. 5, no. 4, N.Y., 1919.
- (8) The Mascoutens or Prairie Potawatomi Indians. Bull. Milwaukee Mus. vol. 6, no. 1, 1924.
- Somerset, H. S.—The Land of the Muskeg. London, 1895.
- Sommier, S.—Un'estate in Siberia. 1885.
- Speck, F. G.—(1) Family Hunting Territories and Social Life of Various Algonkian Bands of the Ottawa Valley. Mem. 70, Anth. Series no. 8, Canada Dept. Mines—Geological Survey. Ottawa 1915.
- (2) Myths and Folk Lore of the Timiskaming Algonquin and Timagami Ojibwa. Mem. 71, Anth. Series no. 9, Ibid.
- (3) Huron Moose Hair Embroidery. A.A. vol. 13, 1911.
- (4) The Social Structure of the Northern Algonkian. Pub. of the American Sociological Society. vol. XLI, 1917.
- (5) —and Heye G. G.—Hunting Charms of the Montagnais and Mistassini. Indian Notes, 1921.
- (6) Bird-Lore of the Northern Indians. vol. VII, Public Lectures by Univ. of Penn. Faculty, 1919-1920.
- (7) Mistassini Hunting Territories in the Labrador Peninsula. A.A. vol. 25, 1923.
- (8) Spiritual Beliefs of the Labrador Indians. Cong. Americanists, The Hague, 1924.
- (9) Scapulimancy: an Old and New World Diffusion. (MS)
- Spencer, Herbert—Principles of Sociology. Vol. 1. 1910.
- St. John, H. C.—The Ainos. Aborigines of Yesso. J.A.I. vol. II, London, 1873.
- Steller, G. W.—Beschreibung von dem Kamtschatka. Frankfort and Leipsic, 1774.
- Sternberg, L.—(1) Die Religion der Giljaken. Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 8:1905.
- (2) The Inau Cult of the Ainu. Boas Anniversary Volume.

- (3) Bemerkungen über Beziehungen zwischen der Morphologie der Giljakischen und Amerikanischen Sprachen. Inter. Congress Americanists. Stuttgart, 1904.
- Stevenson, M. C.—(1) The Sia. 11 R.B.A.E. 1894.
- (2) The Zuni. 23 R.B.A.E.
- Swanton, J. R.—(1) Contributions to the Ethnology of the Haida. Jesup, vol. 5. Mem. A.M.N.H., N.Y.
- (2) Social Condition; Beliefs and Linguistic Relationship of the Tlingit Indians. 26 R.B.A.E. pp. 391 sq. Washington, 1908.
- Teit, James—(1) The Lillooet Indians. Jesup, vol. 2.
- (2) The Shuswap Indians. Jesup vol. 2.
- (3) Notes on the Chilcotin Indians. Jesup vol. 2, Appendix pp. 759-789.
- (4) The Thompson Indians of British Columbia. Jesup vol. 1.
- Thomas, Cyrus—Numerical Systems of Mexico and Central America. 19 R.B.A.E.
- Thomas, N. W.—Article, Animals. H.E. vol. 1.
- Thompson, David—Narrative of his Explorations in Western America, 1784-1812. Ed. by J. B. Tyrrell, Champlain Soc. edition. Toronto, 1916.
- Thompson-Seton, Ernest—Life Histories of Northern Animals. 2 vol.
- Torii, R.—Etudes archeologiques et ethnologiques les Ainu des Isles Kouriles Jour. of the College of Science, Imperial Univ. Tokyo, vol. XLII, 1919
- Toy, C. H.—Introduction to the History of Religions, 1913.
- Tronson, J. M.—Personal Narrative of a Voyage to Japan, Kamtschatka, Siberia, Tartary, etc. London, 1859.
- Trotter, Spencer—The Geographical Relations of the North American Fauna. Bull. Geo. Soc. of Phila., vol. 17, no. 1, 1910.
- Trusler, J.—See Pallas.
- Turi, Johan—(1) Das Buch des Lappen. Herausgegeben von Emilie Demant, Frankfurt am Main. 1912.
- (2) —and Per Turi. Lappish Texts. Ed. by E. Demant-Hatt. Kopenhagen. 1918-1919.
- Tylor, E. B.—Primitive Culture. 2 vol. 1913.
- Vanderlip, W. H. and Hulbert, H. B.—In Search of a Siberian Klondike. 1903.
- Von Brandt—The Ainos and Japanese. J.A.I. III, 1874.
- Von Siebold, H.—Ethnologische Studien über die Aino auf der Insel Yesso. Supplement to Zeit. f. Eth. vol. 13, 1881.
- Waterman, T.T. (and collaborators)—Native Houses of Western North America. Indian Notes, 1921.
- Wissler, Clark—(1) The American Indian. 1917.
- (2) Indians of the Plains. 1912.
- (3) The Story of the Crooked Knife. Nat. Hist. vol. XXIII, 1923. pp. 159-161.
- (4) Man and Culture. N.Y. 1923.
- (5) The Social Life of the Blackfoot Indians. A.P.A.M. vol. 7, part 1, 1911.

- Wood, W. Martin—The Hairy Men of Yesso, Transactions of the Ethn. Soc. of London. N.S. IV, 1866.
- Wright, William H.—(1) The Grizzly Bear. 1909.
(2) The Black Bear. 1910.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.